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The University of South Florida (USF) 2002 Campus Climate Survey was designed to provide quantitative and qualitative information about perceptions, levels of satisfaction and specific experiences among faculty and staff on the USF Tampa campus in the areas of diversity, equity and inclusivity in campus life. Several methods were utilized to administer the survey: e-mail/intranet, mail, and one-on-one interviews for those participants needing special assistance. Full-time faculty and staff (A&P, or Administrative and Professional, and USPS, or University Support Personnel) at the Tampa campus were surveyed during September – October 2002. The survey included both closed and open-ended questions concerning attitudes relative to diversity, climate, morale, individual experiences at USF, issues faced by women and minorities, and general demographic information.

The main objective of this research initiative was to use the results of the survey as a part of a strategic planning process to enhance diversity and the overall campus climate at the University of South Florida Tampa campus. Overall the survey results add insight into USF faculty and staff experiences and perceptions and offer a wide variety of research topics requiring in-depth exploration.

Among the most significant findings presented in this report are the following:

**Characteristics and Representativeness of Survey Respondents**

A total of 1,827 out of 5,029 faculty, A&P, and USPS employees on the Tampa campus responded to the survey for an overall response rate of 36.3%. 1,664 employees responded to the online survey, and another 163 filled out the pencil and paper survey and returned it through campus mail. A response rate of 36.3% is a respectable response rate for surveys administered primarily online, and a good rate for campus climate surveys of this nature. In other words, we can be reasonably confident that the survey responses of the 1,827 individuals who responded to the survey are reflective of the attitudes and perceptions of the larger USF employee population.

Survey respondents come from every university division and represent every major demographic characteristic of the USF employee population. The highest percentage of respondents indicate that they are affiliated with the College of Arts and Sciences (272 respondents or 16.8% of all respondents), followed by Administrative Services (214 or 13.2%), Health Sciences (164 or 10.1%), other administrative offices (141 or 8.7%), Student Affairs (134 or 8.3%), and Education (128 or 7.9%). In terms of race, 1,229 (or 74.4% of) respondents indicate that they are White, 164 (or 9.9%) report being Black, 114 (or 6.9%) report being Hispanic, 41 (or 2.5%) report being Asian, and another 104 (or 6.3%) report some other race (e.g., Middle Eastern, Native American, multiracial, etc.). Because these proportions are relatively consistent with their proportions in the larger USF population, we can also be reasonably confident that the survey responses of the
various university divisions and of various racial and ethnic groups are representative of the attitudes and perceptions of these groups within the larger USF employee population.

The only group that appears to be over-represented in the survey is women. In other words, women responded to the survey with greater frequency than we anticipated based on their numbers in the USF employee population. Instead of there being an almost equal number of female respondents as male (which is what we were expecting), a total of 1,019 (or 61.6%) of the 1,655 respondents who reported their sex stated they are women, and only 636 (or 38.4%) of respondents reported being male. This finding is particularly surprising given that males tend to out-respond females on web-based surveys in general. The over-representation of women in the USF campus climate survey leads us to believe that women at USF are either more interested in the topic than men, or are more likely to be in work positions that made the completion of the online survey easier.

**Attitudes Relative to Diversity and Climate at USF in General**

In order to determine respondents’ attitudes about whether USF provides adequate opportunities to increase understanding of diverse groups, respondents were asked to report their level of agreement with the statement “USF provides opportunities that promote better understanding of...” followed by a listing of eight different groups. Although respondents evaluated USF’s efforts in promoting understanding of some groups slightly more favorably than for other groups, for 7 of the 8 groups mentioned, a majority (over 50%) of respondents reported that they either agreed or agreed strongly that USF provides such opportunities. Racial and ethnic minorities, women, and people with disabilities are among the groups respondents feel are best served by USF’s efforts to promote understanding of diverse groups.

Respondents agree/strongly agree that USF provides opportunities to increase understanding of....

- 73% racial and ethnic minorities
- 72% women
- 67% people with disabilities
- 62% people of different religious backgrounds
- 61% non-native English speaking people
- 56% people of different political affiliations
- 52% people of different economic backgrounds
- 42% gay and lesbian individuals

These data indicate that a variety of groups especially those from different economic backgrounds, as well as gay, lesbians and bisexual would benefit from USF’s efforts to increase the understanding of diverse groups. It is these two groups that most respondents identify as being under-represented in programs and initiatives designed to increase respect for diversity.

Respondents’ ratings of USF’s efforts to foster understanding of diverse groups are, in part, dependent on the gender and race of the respondent him/herself. Women, for instance, are less likely than men to be satisfied with USF’s initiatives to encourage understanding of women.
Whereas 69.1% of women either agreed (53.2) or strongly agreed (15.9%) that “USF provides opportunities that promote understanding of women,” 78.4% of men either agreed (46.3%) or strongly agreed (32.1%) with the statement.

Similarly, although the majority of racial and ethnic minorities agree that USF is doing a good job promoting understanding of various racial and ethnic groups, Blacks report least favorable evaluations, followed by Asians, Latinos, and Whites. The following breakdown represents the percentage of each group that agrees with the statement “USF provides opportunities that promote better understanding of racial and ethnic minorities.”

54.4% of Blacks agree
68.3% of Asians agree,
68.8% of Latinos agree,
77% of Whites agree.

Arab/Middle Eastern respondents give relatively low ratings to USF’s efforts to enhance respect for people of different economic, religious, and political backgrounds and beliefs. This latter finding is not surprising in light of the climate in our nation following the events of September 11, 2001.

In sum, survey respondents are not in complete agreement about where efforts to increase respect for diversity should be targeted. Many female respondents call for additional education and understanding of women, whereas many Blacks and Arab Americans call for additional initiatives on behalf of racial, ethnic, religious, and/or political minorities.

Respondents, in general, agree that it is easy at USF to get to know people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds.

A full 72.4% of respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement “At USF getting to know people with racial/ethnic backgrounds different from my own has been easy.”

27.6% either disagreed or disagreed strongly with the same statement.

What’s particularly noteworthy and positive about the data on this specific question item is that the level of agreement does not systematically vary across the sexes, racial and ethnic groups, between people of different sexual orientations, or between those with and without a disability. In other words, people of different sexes, races and ethnicities, sexual orientations, and disability status share virtually the same level of ease in getting to know people of different races on this campus.

Respondents indicate very high levels of comfort in sharing their work environment with people of diverse backgrounds, with slightly lower comfort levels around openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual co-workers. In contrast, gay, lesbian, and bisexual co-workers not only meet, but also exceed, every other category of respondents in terms of their own comfort working and associating with diverse colleagues.
Climate in the University and the Work Unit
Respondents in general report strong feelings of acceptance at both the university level and the level of their work unit. Feelings of acceptance are somewhat higher in their immediate work environment than at the university in general, a finding attributable perhaps to the fact that such feelings are often generated in more close-knit groups. Although men and women are equally likely to feel accepted at USF, other segments of respondents report lower feelings of acceptance. Black and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents are less likely than Whites, Asians, or Latinos to report feeling accepted at the university and in their immediate work environments. Feelings of acceptance at USF also appear to differ for those of different sexual orientations and disability statuses. In comparison to heterosexuals, gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents give significantly lower mean scores on feelings of acceptance at the university and in their work environments. In comparison to those without disabilities, those with a disability give slightly lower ratings on feelings of acceptance at the university in general and in their immediate work environments. These findings suggest that efforts to promote stronger feelings of acceptance among the USF employee population should be targeted toward Blacks, Arab Americans, gays, lesbians and bisexuals, and those with disabilities.

USF’s Support for Racial and Ethnic Diversity
When asked whether USF is taking sufficient steps to support racial/ethnic/national diversity among the faculty/staff and students, respondents voice moderate levels of agreement, with more respondents agreeing with these statements than disagreeing. Respondents voice the highest level of satisfaction with USF’s support of diversity among students, moderate levels of satisfaction with its support of diversity among staff, and lowest levels of satisfaction with its support of diversity among faculty.

When asked whether they believe “USF has visible leadership…to foster diversity on campus” or whether “USF provides activities to promote multicultural understanding,” respondents again report higher levels of agreement than disagreement. Respondents’ attitudes on these issues appear to vary across racial groups, however. Specifically, Arab/Middle Eastern respondents and Blacks are the least likely to agree either that USF has visible leadership or that it is taking sufficient steps to foster diversity, and in some cases their average scores reveal an overall level of dissatisfaction among these two groups. Blacks are also less likely than whites to agree either that USF is taking sufficient steps to support racial/ethnic/national diversity among the staff, faculty, and students, or that “USF provides activities to promote multicultural understanding.” On this latter measure, however, the average scores for all racial groups indicate higher levels of agreement than disagreement.

Heterogeneity of Responses about Diversity Efforts
A careful analysis of responses to the first free-response question inviting respondents to comment on the survey reveals a variety of opinions about USF’s efforts to support diversity and multicultural understanding. Although a small percentage of respondents believe that USF’s administration is not pro-active enough, an equally small percentage, especially among the staff, believe the university has gone too far in supporting diversity. To illustrate this, approximately 10% of the 217 staff that volunteered answers to an open-ended question on this topic reported that USF might be doing too much to promote diversity. What must not be overlooked,
however, is that the majority of respondents fall in between these more extreme positions, and that overall there are higher levels of satisfaction than dissatisfaction with the administration’s current efforts to support diversity and multicultural understanding.

**Respondent’s Suggestions about Diversity**
Many respondents voice an interest in supporting the university’s efforts to promote diversity and multiculturalism, and they offer a number of suggestions to university administrators. Among the staff, these suggestions range from the need for additional presentations and special events on diversity, to the adoption of more creative and inclusive diversity program initiatives, to diversifying the food service. Many of the faculty’s suggestions for improving diversity and multicultural understanding focused instead on the curriculum, and here we see a desire among faculty for a stronger and more comprehensive international studies curriculum.

**Free Expression of Ideas at USF**
A large majority, 70% of respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement: “USF provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and opinions.” Thirty percent of respondents, on the other hand, either disagree (16%) or strongly disagree (14%) with the statement. A similar disparity of attitudes is evident in response to the question “University officials should have the right to ban people with extreme views from speaking on campus,” but here the distribution is more highly skewed in the direction of disagreement, with approximately 56% of respondents either disagreeing (24%) or strongly disagreeing (32%) with the statement. Further analysis of responses to these statements reveals that respondents’ answers are influenced by their level of educational attainment, their race/ethnicity, and their sexual orientation. Specifically, those with a post-graduate degree, those who are Middle Eastern/Arab, and those who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual are less likely to agree that USF provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and opinions.

**Domestic Partners**
Overall attitudes among USF employees toward the extension and adoption of domestic partner benefits are either neutral or favorable. Mean scores on the questions dealing with these benefits indicate there is more support than opposition for the adoption of such policies. Among the demographic variables represented in the climate survey, race, employment classification, age, and sexual orientation appear to be the strongest predictors of respondents’ attitudes toward domestic partner benefits. Blacks are less supportive than either Whites or Hispanics, USPS staff are less supportive than A&P staff, who are, in turn, less supportive than faculty, and those over 60 years-old are less supportive than every succeeding generation. Not surprising, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals reported the highest levels of support for domestic partner benefits, far surpassing their heterosexual colleagues in calling for the adoption of such policies. Analysis of responses to the first free-response question inviting respondents to comment on domestic partner benefits reveals a wide array of opinions, both pro and con. Many respondents report that such benefits are needed to bring USF in line with many other colleges and universities; to enhance the university’s capacity to attract the highest quality faculty and staff; or to end what is seen as a discriminatory practice. Other respondents believe such benefits should not be pursued, stating that they are either contrary to their own personal religious values, or that they would be too expensive for the university to implement.
Climate in the Work Unit
Most respondents to the survey report satisfaction with the climate of diversity and fairness in their department and work units. Of the various dimensions of climate measured, the highest level of satisfaction is expressed with respect to the fairness of job performance evaluations, followed by fairness in allocation of work load. The least amount of satisfaction is evident with respect to equality of treatment of women and minorities in the work unit. Interestingly, women and men report similarly high levels of satisfaction, and both sexes appear to be pretty highly satisfied with these various dimensions of workplace climate. Comparison of levels of satisfaction across racial groups, however, reveals that certain racial and ethnic minority groups (i.e., Black, Hispanic, and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents) are less satisfied than Whites with the climate of diversity and fairness in their work units. Although most racial/ethnic groups manifest similar levels of satisfaction with the climate of diversity and fairness in their work units, Black, Hispanic, and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents report lower levels of satisfaction than Whites in efforts to recruit minorities, and Blacks report lower levels of satisfaction than all other racial/ethnic groups in their supervisor’s allocation of work load and evaluation of job performance.

Attitudes Relative to Morale
Of the six statements on the questionnaire designed to measure levels of morale among faculty and staff at USF, respondents reported higher levels of satisfaction than dissatisfaction to four of them. Among the four questions receiving responses of agreement, the highest level of agreement is expressed with respect to feeling “as though I belong to the USF community,” followed by believing that “taking a leave from work for personal or family reasons... would not hinder... opportunities for advancement.” More moderate levels of satisfaction were voiced with respect to “how performance evaluations are conducted” and “opportunities for advancement.” The least amount of agreement/satisfaction was expressed to the statement “I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job” (as it appeared on the staff questionnaire) or “I am satisfied with the distribution of merit increases in my department” (as it was stated on the faculty questionnaire).

Quantitative analyses of these data on morale reveal that workplace morale is influenced by a variety of factors including employment classification, gender, disability status, age, and length of time at USF. Satisfaction with opportunities for advancement, for instance, is lower among USPS employees and those with disabilities, while USPS employees and those with disabilities are among the groups most likely to express fear that taking a leave from work might hinder their opportunities for advancement. Although both men and women tend to disagree that the “balancing of family and job obligations has become problematic” in their work unit, women are somewhat less likely than men to agree with this statement. Also, satisfaction with recognition for job performance/distribution of merit increases is lower among faculty, those who are older, and those who have been employed at USF for 20 or more years. Workplace morale does not appear to be influenced by other demographic characteristics such as race/ethnicity and sexual orientation.
A total of 641 (or 35%) of respondents provided detailed comments on their morale at USF. This figure includes 214 staff, or 18.7% of the 1,146 USPS and A&P employees, and a total of 427 faculty (or 64% of the 667 faculty) who completed the survey.

Among the USPS & A&P Staff, responses to the open-ended question asking why they are not satisfied with their current opportunities or position revealed four major reasons why they may be dissatisfied with their current opportunities or position:

1. Dissatisfaction with inequities in job position selection, promotion, and/or evaluation;
2. Dissatisfaction with pay and/or benefits
3. Dissatisfaction with the adequacy of job training; and
4. Experience of discrimination or lack of respect.

The most frequently mentioned concern in both job classifications was the inequities they experienced in job position selection, promotion, and/or evaluation.

Of the 427 faculty who provided comments, the most frequently mentioned reasons for why they may not be satisfied with their current opportunities or position are:

1. Dissatisfaction with pay and distribution of merit increases
2. Dissatisfaction with workload and lack of adequate support staff;
3. Frustration with how bureaucracy interferes with ability to conduct quality research; and
4. Experience of discrimination or lack of respect

Experiences at USF

A full section of the campus climate survey was designed to gauge the frequency and nature of incidents and events on campus that run contrary to the university’s quest to create a welcoming, comfortable, and inclusive atmosphere for diverse populations.

Insensitive and Disparaging Remarks
Respondents were asked: “Please indicate the number of times within the last year you have heard a student (staff/faculty) make an insensitive or disparaging remark about…”, which was followed by a listing of a variety of groups. Most respondents report having heard these types of insensitive remarks either rarely or never. The most frequently heard disparaging comments relate to people with particular political beliefs, people of particular religions, of particular races/ethnicities, and people whose native language is not English.

Events where Particular Groups would Feel Uncomfortable or Unwelcome
A full 87.4% of respondents reported that, within the last year, they have not attended any college/university events where members of particular groups might have felt uncomfortable or unwelcome. However, a total of 212, or 12.6% of the respondents reported that they had attended an event at USF within the last year at which members of particular groups might feel uncomfortable or unwelcome.

Many of those who attended an event perceived as being uncomfortable for racial/ethnic minorities described events that would be uncomfortable for Arab or Middle Eastern people.
They described primarily situations in which inappropriate or harassing remarks were made about Arabs as a reaction to the events of September 11, 2001.

When respondents spoke of events at which gay, lesbian, or bisexual people would feel uncomfortable, they usually spoke of social events for which the invitation/announcement did not include “significant others,” or social functions where gays, lesbians, and bisexuals felt uncomfortable inviting their significant others.

Many others reported having attended events perceived as being discomforting for those of particular political affiliations.

Employees’ Treatment of Students
When respondents were asked whether they “have ever witnessed any USF employee (faculty or staff) take advantage of a student, research assistant, or teaching assistant,” 86.7% responded “no”, and 222, or 13.1%, of the 1,689 respondents answered “yes.”

In the data gathered by those who commented on such instances, the most common report of mistreatment was an employee asking and/or expecting a graduate student to either work in excess of the contracted workload or to conduct menial work, personal work, or other inappropriate tasks.

Personal Experiences of Harassment
Of the 1,637 faculty and staff who responded to the question “Have you personally ever been the target of harassment at USF?”, a majority of respondents (1,226, or 74.8%) did not indicate being the recipients of any form of harassment at USF. However, some respondents (411 or 25.1%) report being the target of some form of harassment during their time at USF. The form of harassment that affects the greatest number of USF employees overall is harassment based on gender, with 201 respondents indicating that they’ve experienced this form of harassment. Other forms of harassment affecting USF employees, listed in descending order, are harassment based on race/ethnicity (119), harassment based on age (100), class (74), political beliefs (64), religion (56), and sexual orientation (40).

Converting these raw numbers into percentages based on the representation of different groups among the survey respondents reveals that: 13.9% of female respondents report having experienced some form of harassment based on gender during their time at USF; 3% of Whites, 21.3% of Blacks, and 17.5% of Hispanics report having experienced harassment based on race/ethnicity; and 37.9% of gay and lesbian respondents report having experienced harassment based on their sexual orientation.

In looking through respondents’ descriptions of these instances, it is clear that “harassment” was understood very broadly to include both serious incidents as well as more benign events (e.g., verbal comments described as “mildly offensive”, the reading of graffiti, etc.). Given this variety of responses and the fact that “harassment” was not clearly defined on the questionnaire, it is reasonable to conclude that this figure is based on a very broad understanding of “harassment” among the respondents. Many other university and college campus climate surveys similarly do
not define “harassment” for their respondents, choosing to leave it vague in order to capture broader information about workplace climate issues. Of the few university campus climate surveys that did define “harassment” they adopted a legal definition and thereby narrowed the scope of responses.

**Experiences of Racial and Ethnic Minorities**

Of the 423 racial and ethnic minorities who completed the survey, 287 (68%) completed a special section of the survey intended for racial/ethnic minorities. In this section, racial/ethnic minorities were asked to report the frequency with which they have experienced various kinds of unpleasant or potentially offensive situations. Results reveal that, on average, racial and ethnic minorities at USF rarely if ever experience overt mistreatment while on campus due to their minority status.

However, when they do encounter unpleasant or potentially offensive situations, it is usually in the form of either feeling like they are expected to speak on behalf of their minority group, or feeling a need to minimize some aspect of their culture in order to fit in. All respondents were provided the opportunity to offer recommendations for improving the campus climate for racial and ethnic minorities. Among the most common suggestions were:
1. continue or improve dialogue between racial and ethnic groups on campus;
2. continue or improve recruitment of racial and ethnic minorities;
3. increase sensitivity and awareness of racial and ethnic differences; and
4. offer more events that raise multicultural awareness.

**Experiences of Women**

Of the 1,019 women who completed the survey, 975 (96%) completed a special section of the survey intended for women. In this section, women were asked to report the frequency with which they have experienced various kinds of unpleasant or potentially offensive situations. Results reveal that although some women have experienced various forms of mistreatment due to their gender, the frequency with which women report these occurrences is relatively low, and somewhat lower than the reports of mistreatment among racial or ethnic minorities and among gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. Of the various kinds of unpleasant experiences encountered by women, the most frequently reported are feeling like their ideas weren’t listed to as carefully as their male co-workers’ ideas, and feeling like their work wasn’t valued as highly as their male co-workers’ work.

All respondents to the survey were provided the opportunity to offer recommendations for improving the campus climate for women. Among the most common suggestions were:
1. improve security on campus to foster personal safety;
2. adopt a more liberal family leave policy;
3. diminish or eliminate salary disparities between men and women;
4. increase availability of affordable child care;
5. offer events that raise awareness of women’s issues; and
6. improve recruitment of women to administration, faculty, and staff.
Experiences of Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals

Of the 94 Gays, Lesbians and Bisexuals who completed the survey, 84 (or 89%) completed a special section of the survey designed to measure the frequency of experiencing various kinds of unpleasant or potentially offensive situations. Of the various situations gays, lesbians, and bisexuals were asked about, the most frequently encountered was one in which they avoided disclosing their sexual orientation/ preference for fear of negative consequences or to avoid intimidation. However, on average, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals at USF rarely if ever experience overt mistreatment due to their sexual orientation/preference while on campus.

All respondents to the survey were provided the opportunity to offer recommendations for improving the campus climate for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. Among the most common suggestions were:

1. ensure security of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals who choose to disclose their sexual orientation;
2. provide domestic partner benefits;
3. offer events that foster dialogue and raise awareness and understanding of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people; and
4. recruit more openly gay people to top positions.

Experiences of People with Disabilities

All 66 (100%) of respondents who reported having a disability completed the section of the survey designed to measure the frequency with which they have experienced unpleasant or potentially offensive situations. As with the other groups, people with disabilities, on average, report rarely, if ever experiencing overt mistreatment due to their disability status. Of the various situations people with disabilities were asked about, the most frequently encountered – though still quite infrequent -- was the lack of accommodations. In fact, numerous respondents, when asked to comment on their answers to these questions stated that the university could do a better job of meeting ADA regulations for building accessibility. The second most frequently mentioned experience among people with disabilities is the decision to not disclose their disability due to a fear of negative consequences.

All respondents to the survey were provided the opportunity to offer recommendations for improving the campus climate for people with disabilities. The most commonly voiced suggestions were

1. improve access by regularly inspecting doors, sidewalks, and parking lots;
2. increase the number and visibility of signs and markers on campus;
3. work to ensure all buildings meet ADA requirements;
4. increase educational efforts among supervisors, faculty, staff, and students about disabilities and mental illness; and
5. offer events that foster dialogue and raise awareness.
I. Introduction

Excellence in achieving diversity and pluralism within the university setting has become increasingly important at USF within the last decade. It has been placed at the forefront of strategic planning efforts at the top levels of university administration. In light of this priority, the Provost’s Office, under the leadership of Provost S. David Stamps, convened a steering committee in the fall of 2001 to explore ways to measure the success of USF’s diversity initiatives and the overall campus climate. After a series of meetings that fall, the steering committee advised the Provost to undertake a campus climate survey to investigate the attitudes and perceptions of faculty and staff with respect to diversity and campus climate. Specifically, the survey, like climate surveys conducted at many other universities, would measure how well faculty and staff think the university is doing in creating a diverse, comfortable, and inclusive campus atmosphere.

On October 8, 2001, Provost Stamps and the Campus Climate Steering Committee met with James Cavendish of the Department of Sociology to discuss research strategies and the process of constructing a questionnaire that could be distributed to faculty and staff at the Tampa campus. Professor Cavendish agreed to lead a team in consulting with various committees representing the diverse interests of faculty and staff at the university. The purpose of these consultations was to solicit ideas from the faculty and staff themselves about what they believed should be included in the survey instrument/questionnaire. The consultations took the form of meetings with the USF Athletic Council (2/15/02), the Latino Faculty and Staff Association (2/20/02), the Black Faculty and Staff Association (2/21/02), the Committee on Black Affairs (3/1/02), the Title IX Committee (3/4/02), the USPS Senate (3/5/02), the Equal Opportunity Committee (3/5/02), the Committee on Issues of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (3/6/02), the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (3/6/02), the Committee on Women’s Status (3/7/02), and the A&P Council (3/12/02). During these meetings, each committee had an opportunity to voice the concerns of the various members of the university community whom they represented. Each committee was also asked to select a representative from their group to serve as a liaison to Professor Cavendish and the Campus Climate Steering Committee. Over the following months, Professor Cavendish reviewed the survey questionnaires and reports constructed by other universities who completed large-scale campus climate surveys. Proposals of various survey questions were shared with liaisons to the various representative bodies for their input, and after in-depth consultation and revisions, the Campus Climate Steering Committee met on March 25, 2002, and again on June 25, 2002, to determine the final content of the survey questionnaire. In the end, it was agreed that the questionnaire would contain the following sections:
Attitudes relative to diversity and climate (with 27 questions)
Attitudes relative to morale (with 9 questions)
Experiences at USF (with 13 questions)
Personal Background (with 11 questions)
Women and Minority Experiences (with 16 questions).

For each section, key questions were extracted from other universities’ campus climate surveys to ensure the validity and reliability of the constructs and to serve potentially as a point of comparison to other universities at some future date.

After much discussion, planning, and revisions to the survey instrument, the Office of Information Technologies distributed a pretest of the survey to the first 100 participants, selected from a computer generated random sample. Results of this pretest were used to determine the effectiveness of the survey instrument in measuring employee attitudes and perceptions and to assist the research team in preparing and launching the Climate Survey to all employees of the Tampa campus. Because many of the respondents to the pretest survey indicated that they would like to have more open-ended questions in which they could share, in their own words, their thoughts, feelings, and comments on the closed-ended questions, several open-ended (or free-response) questions were added to the survey following each of the major sections of closed-ended question items.

With the assistance of the staff at Information Technologies, the 2002 USF Campus Climate Survey was finally launched online to all faculty and A&P and USPS staff on the Tampa campus on September 12, 2002, within just a few weeks of the faculty’s return from summer session. One week prior to this date, all employees received a flyer in their paychecks notifying them that “the Campus Climate Survey is here,” and asking them to complete the questionnaire that “will be sent out through e-mail and campus mail next week.” This flyer also presented the internet address for the Web Page of the Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity (http://www.usf.edu/eoa/campus climate survey.asp) where recipients could learn more about the survey project. The survey itself was sent through e-mail with a cover letter from Provost Stamps, Gregory Paveza, President of the Faculty Senate, Renee Seay, President of the USPS Senate, and Sheila Holbrook, President of the A&P Council. The cover letter, copied in Appendix A of this report, explained the purpose of the project, described why participation in the survey was important, and illustrated how the anonymity of respondents would be guaranteed.

The initial launch of the survey on September 12, 2002, resulted in 1,933 responses, a small portion of which were from OPS employees who, although not the intended recipients of the survey, were on the large e-mail directories used by Information Technologies. Follow-up e-mails were sent to non-respondents on October 16 and again at the end of October to solicit the full participation of faculty, A&P, and USPS staff. In addition to these efforts to reach faculty and staff through an e-mail distribution of the survey, paper and pencil questionnaires (in both English and Spanish) were sent on October 15 to 453 employees in Administrative Services (Auxiliary Services and Physical Plant) and Student Life and Wellness (Campus Recreation, Marshall Center, and Residence Services) known not to have e-mail accounts.
In early November, 2002, Professor Cavendish began to clean and analyze the raw data generated from the online surveys with the assistance of graduate students in his course “SPSS and Social Research.” In early December, once the data from the mail “pencil and paper” surveys had been fully entered, the data from the online survey and the mail survey were merged to create one large, combined data set which was used for all of the quantitative analyses reported here. This data set has been cleaned for statistical analyses, and because the survey was anonymous, it contains no personal identifying information. For these reasons, the raw data set is available to individuals, committees, and/or units within the university community interested in conducting their own analyses.

This report summarizes the results of the first series of analyses conducted on the 2002 USF Campus Climate Survey data by James Cavendish and the graduate student assistants to the project. It represents a general summary of the items of greatest interest to the Campus Climate Steering Committee and some detailed investigations conducted by graduate students in the “SPSS and Social Research” course offered during the fall of 2002. Because the combined data set contains 1,827 usable cases and over 170 variables, 19 of which are qualitative in nature, it is impossible for one research report to summarize all of the potential analyses, and it is hoped that representatives from each of the presidential advisory committees mentioned above will take the initiative to explore these data more fully. Other universities which have conducted similar surveys typically present a raw data file with perhaps a preliminary summary profile to each of the organizational divisions or representative committees so they can later conduct further analyses in line with their own organizational objectives or special interests.

This report closely follows the outline of the questionnaire that respondents received. It includes sections on attitudes relative to diversity and climate, attitudes relative to morale, experiences at USF, and the unique experiences of racial and ethnic minorities, women, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, and people with disabilities. Demographic items were also included in the survey to assess the representativeness of the sample and to examine important differences in respondents’ opinions based on various employee characteristics. Consequently, for each section of the report, any notable differences between various demographic groups (e.g., genders, races, sexual orientations) will be presented. Respondents were also asked to submit “open-ended” or “free-response” comments to 19 questions asking about their experiences at USF and about the survey instrument itself. Although many of these comments are incorporated into the present report, a more thorough content analysis of these free-response comments is necessary in order to systematically determine those issues that are of highest priority to respondents. In some sections, results of some preliminary content analyses are provided to illustrate the full potential of the qualitative data for those wishing to exploit them further.

II. The Response Rate

A total of 1,827 out of 5,029 faculty, A&P, and USPS employees on the Tampa campus responded to the survey for an overall response rate of 36.3%. 1,664 employees
responded to the online survey, and another 163 filled out the pencil and paper survey and returned it through campus mail. Of those who responded to the pencil and paper survey, nine staff completed the Spanish version of the questionnaire, with two employees asking to meet with our Spanish-speaking interviewer for assistance in completing the questionnaire.

A response rate of 36.3% is a respectable response rate for surveys administered primarily online, and a good rate for campus climate surveys of this nature. Web survey companies usually experience response rates from 30% to 70%, with the higher rates generally obtained on surveys of employees or customers, where the sampling frame is supplied by the organization requesting the survey, much like the USF Campus Climate Survey. Lower rates than these are typically obtained in web surveys of the general population.

In comparison to the response rates of other universities whose campus climate surveys were mailed to the entire faculty and staff population on their campuses, USF’s response rate is comparable, though somewhat lower. For instance, the University of Saint Thomas received responses from 42% of the faculty and 43% of the staff in its “2000 Campus Climate Survey.” Penn State obtained a 41% response to its survey, and Indiana State University received responses from 50.7% of the faculty and 43.3% of the staff on its survey of the racial and national origin climate at its university. The University of Arizona, which unlike these others sent its survey to a random sample of faculty and students, obtained a 20% response rate on its survey of campus climate for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. All of these surveys are available online for readers wishing to make additional comparisons between USF’s Campus Climate Survey and similar surveys conducted by other prominent universities.

As a point of observation, campus climate surveys administered to student populations appear to have significantly lower response rates. The University of St. Thomas obtained a 21% response from students to its “2000 Campus Climate Survey;” and Rutgers University obtained a 8.3% response to its “Student Needs Assessment Survey for Lesbian and Gay Issues.”

An additional 456 OPS employees responded to the initial filtering questions of the online survey, and for them we have responses to the statement: “Although our present survey is not being completed by OPS employees, we invite you to share whatever general concerns you have about campus climate in the space provided. These comments may serve as the basis for a future investigation of OPS concerns.” These 456 OPS respondents were not included in the above response rate calculations because they were not intended to be the main focus of the present survey.

Although we have an adequate response rate overall, it may have been higher if the research team had foreseen some of the technical problems it would encounter with the online survey. These technical difficulties were both systemic and individual in nature. Among the more systemic technical problems reported by Information Technologies were: FMHI having a block (firewall) on all e-mail messages which its computers
perceived as “spam” or “junk mail;” some departments blocking their employees from using the internet; lack of inclusion of a few small departments within the Heath Sciences Center on the larger e-mail listing. Fortunately, all of these technical problems were addressed before the second mailing of the questionnaire, but because some populations did not receive the initial mailing, these populations did not have the same number of follow-up “reminders” afforded to others, and hence have somewhat lower response rates than those who had received the initial mailing.

Among the problems encountered by individual computer users, according to Information Technologies, were the following: some individuals had difficulty using their browsers; MAC users could not access the survey; and some individuals left the survey open on their browsers for too long and experienced a time-out expiration problem. At least 90 people contacted Information Technologies with these types of concerns and many of these individuals later completed their questionnaires either online after a re-launch or on paper after contacting the research office with a request for a mail questionnaire.

The response rate might also have been higher had all of the respondents completed the questionnaire in its entirety instead of discontinuing after completing only a few questions. Most of the approximately 300 people who terminated the questionnaire did not provide a rationale for their decision, and some of them may have experienced technical difficulties but did not contact Information Technologies for a solution. At least a few others explained their discontinuance by voicing their opposition to the survey’s intent. One respondent, for instance, stated:

I make no responses because I do not feel this should be a priority of the university. We should be here to discover and share knowledge. Promoting (as opposed to studying) diversity adds little value to this mission and may detract from accomplishing it.

In the end, after cleaning the data set of these largely incomplete responses, we were left with a total of 1,827 usable cases, 1,664 cases from the online survey and 163 cases from the paper-and-pencil survey. Although this response rate is somewhat lower (though comparable) to other universities’ climate survey response rates, there is every reason to believe that the respondents to USF’s climate survey are representative of the larger USF employee population. To illustrate our reason for this confidence, it is necessary to compare the characteristics of respondents to the characteristics of the larger USF employee population.

III. The Characteristics and Representativeness of Survey Respondents

Characteristics of Respondents

The demographic characteristics of the survey respondents are summarized in Tables 1-7 at the end of this report. Here, we see that a majority of respondents who reported their sex are female (61.6%), slightly over 60% are in the 41-60 age range, 20% are in the 31-
40 age range, with lower percentages (about 10% each) either under 30 or over 60 years of age. Seventy-four percent of respondents are White/Caucasian, 9.9% are Black/African American, 6.9% are Hispanic, and 2.5% are Asian. Of those who responded to the question “Were you born in the U.S.?” 86.8% reported “yes,” and 13.2% reported “no,” that they were born outside the United States. Approximately 90% of respondents who answered the question about their sexual orientation reported being heterosexual, 2.2% reported being bisexual, 3.6% reported being gay or lesbian, and another 4.7% reported “non-identified.” Not surprisingly, in terms of educational background, 54% of the survey respondents have some type of post-graduate degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., Master’s degree, etc.). Nineteen percent report that the Bachelor’s degree is the highest degree they’ve attained, 6.6% the Associate’s, and 11.6% some college courses. Only 8.5% of survey respondents report their highest level of education being a high school diploma or less. In terms of disability status, approximately 4% of USF employees report having some type of disability.

The employment characteristics of the survey respondents, which are summarized in Tables 8-11, are also worth noting. Approximately thirty nine percent of respondents are USPS staff, 24% are A&P staff, and 37% are faculty. Among the faculty who responded, the most represented groups are non-tenure track instructors, followed by full professors, associate professors, and then assistant professors. Over a third of the survey population (41.7%) have worked at USF for only 5 years or less. Nineteen percent report working here for 6-10 years, 13.7% for 11-15 years, 10.2% for 16-20 years, and a full 15.3% for over 20 years. Survey respondents come from every university division, with the highest percentages of respondents indicating that they are affiliated with Arts and Sciences (16.8%), followed by Administrative Services (13.2%), Health Sciences (10.1%), other administrative offices (8.7%), Student Affairs (8.3%), and Education (7.9%).

**Representativeness of Respondents**

Using the 1,827 valid cases in the data set, we are able to determine that some groups are better represented in the data than others. Because this survey is designed to measure the attitudes and perceptions of faculty and staff with respect to diversity and campus climate, it is most crucial to determine the extent to which minority groups are represented in the data. When we compare the representation of various groups in the Campus Climate Survey with their representation in the USF employee population (as reported in the October 17, 2002, “Employee Demographic Report” on InfoMart³, http://usfweb.usf.edu/usfirp/infomart/), we find that:

- Response rates vary somewhat across various employee categories, with the most dramatic differences evident among faculty and A&P. Together, faculty, A&P, and USPS employees make up a total of 5,029 employees on the Tampa campus, as reported by InfoMart in October, 2002. Of those 5,029 employees, 2,125 (or 42.3%) are faculty, 835 (or 16.6%) are A&P, and 2,069 (or 41.1%) are USPS. Of the usable cases in the Campus Climate Survey, on the other hand, 667 (or 36.5%) are faculty, 434 (or 23.9%) are A&P, and 712 (or 39.3%) are USPS. In order to determine how representative the survey respondents are of the larger USF employee population,
therefore, one needs only subtract the percentage of each group among the survey respondents from the percentage of each group among the USF population. Here, we discover that faculty are somewhat under-represented in the survey (by 5.8%), and A&P are over-represented by 7.3%. USPS, on the other hand, are over-represented by a negligible 1.8%. This moderate under-representation of faculty and over-representation of staff may be explained, in part, by the different nature of their day-to-day activities and how this might affect their likelihood of completing an online questionnaire. A&P staff, it might be argued, are more likely to work through the course of the day at their computer terminals, while faculty, on the other hand, are often working between their homes, offices, laboratories, and classrooms.

♦ Response rates vary only slightly across racial/ethnic categories, a finding that is of great significance in a campus climate survey. As Table 12 illustrates, African American and Asian American staff are less represented among survey respondents than among the USF employee population, but this difference appears to be substantial only for Black USPS employees and Asian faculty. Significantly, all categories of Hispanics and Whites, two categories of Blacks (faculty and A&P), and two categories of Asians (A&P and USPS) are represented among survey respondents in about the same proportions as we would expect based on their representation in the USF employee population. Because of this lack of observable response bias based on race and ethnicity, we can be confident that the survey responses of various racial and ethnic groups are representative of the attitudes and perceptions of the larger USF employee population.

♦ Response rates vary most dramatically by sex, with females being significantly more likely to respond to the survey than males. As Table 13 shows, for every employment category – faculty, A&P, and USPS -- males are significantly less represented, and females more represented, than would be expected based on their proportions in the USF population. This disparity based on sex is most evident among USPS employees and faculty, where the percentage over/under-representation is 7.35% and 9.26% respectively. Clearly, women were more inclined than men to complete this survey. Although this introduces some potential response bias, the larger representation of females among respondents is understandable. Given the nature of the survey, perhaps women were more likely than men to see the survey as a way of voicing concerns they might not ordinarily get to express.

IV. Attitudes Relative to Diversity and Climate at USF in General

The first section of the climate survey questionnaire asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with a variety of attitudinal questions. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they strongly agreed (SA), agreed (A), neither agreed nor disagreed (N), disagreed (D), or strongly disagreed (SD) with up to 19 statements about USF’s climate. In order to examine respondents’ attitudes relative to these statements, these response categories (i.e., agree, disagree, etc.) were converted to numeric values, and means were calculated for each question item. For all of these “likert scale” questions in which
responses ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree, response categories were coded so that 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree. Thus, in evaluating mean scores, it is important to keep in mind that any score below a 3 represents a position of disagreement, and any score above a 3 represents a position of agreement, with the higher values being the most agreement. The value 3 is the neutral response (i.e., indicating “neither agree nor disagree”).

**Does USF promote better understanding of diverse groups? (Questions 1a - 1h)**

The first series of questions in the climate survey (questions 1a-1h) asked respondents their level of agreement that “USF provides opportunities that promote better understanding of” various groups on campus, including gay, lesbian, bisexual people, non-native English speaking people, racial minorities, and others. Table 14 presents the means on each of these items for the entire sample and for males and females in the sample. As the “Total” column of Table 14 shows, respondents agree overall that USF does a good job in providing opportunities that promote understanding of diverse groups on campus. Mean scores range from a low of 3.32 to a high of 3.83, all somewhat over the neutral value of 3.

As this comparison of total mean values reveals, respondents evaluate USF’s efforts to promote understanding of some groups slightly more favorably than for other groups. When we look at the responses of all respondents to the survey (again, as reported in the “Total” column), racial and ethnic minorities, women, and people with disabilities are among the groups all respondents feel are best served by USF’s efforts to promote understanding.

In every case, except with respect to gays and lesbians, the majority of all respondents agree/strongly agree that USF provides opportunities to increase understanding of….

- 73% racial and ethnic minorities
- 72% women
- 67% people with disabilities
- 62% people of different religious backgrounds
- 61% non-native English speaking people
- 56% people of different political affiliations
- 52% people of different economic backgrounds
- 42% gay and lesbian individuals

Seventy-three percent of respondents either agreed (49.4%) or strongly agreed (23.5%) that USF provides opportunities to increase understanding of racial and ethnic minorities; 72.4% either agreed (50.3%) or strongly agreed (22.1%) that USF provides opportunities to increase understanding of women; and 67% either agreed (48%) or strongly agreed (19.3%) when asked the same about people with disabilities. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual people and people of different economic status, are among those least served, in these respondents’ opinions. Only 52% agreed (39.5%) or strongly agreed (12.5%) concerning people of different economic backgrounds, and only 42.3% agreed (34.5%) or strongly agreed (7.8%) with respect to gay, lesbian, and bisexual people. Clearly, among those who benefit least from USF’s efforts to promote understanding, according to respondents,
are people of different economic backgrounds, and gay, lesbian, and bisexual people. It is these two groups that most respondents identify as being under-represented in programs and initiatives designed to increase respect for diversity.

The standard deviations are reported along side the mean scores as an indicator of the average spread of observations around the mean. The standard deviation is best thought of as a measure of the homogeneity/ heterogeneity of the responses on that particular question item, with the lower standard deviations indicating a lower degree of heterogeneity (i.e., higher degree of homogeneity), and the higher values suggesting a higher degree of heterogeneity. Interestingly, respondents are most heterogeneous in their beliefs about USF’s ability to promote understanding of people of different political beliefs, indicating that the USF population isn’t of like mind in evaluating efforts in this area. Clearly, as confirmed in the qualitative data, there is a segment of the USF population that believes strongly that people of differing political beliefs are not as respected as they should be. As one respondent to the open-ended question stated:

> Overall, I feel the University does a good job with diversity. However, I must say that I believe faculty members with conservative political views would be roundly criticized if they ever expressed these views openly. I am neither liberal nor conservative, but can identify with both at certain times. There have been many moments when I have felt reluctant to express any view that is sympathetic to a conservative agenda for fear of being ostracized by my colleagues. I don't think conservatism is ever considered as a viewpoint that requires recognition or respect, and that is just as bad as the other extreme.

Another faculty member went so far as to say: “The only group that I see unlistened to and unsupported and even discriminated against at USF is conservative Christians and republicans.” Although this sentiment is certainly not representative of large numbers of respondents, and may even be viewed as belittling the experiences of others, it must be acknowledged that at least a segment of respondents don’t feel that diversity of political opinions is sufficiently respected at USF.

Gender Differences

Table 14 also presents separate mean scores for men and women. Although it is sometimes difficult to determine the dimensions on which men’s and women’s attitudes differ, independent sample t-tests of equality of means were performed on each of these attitudinal items to pinpoint precisely those areas where men and women differ most. Those t-tests, though not reported graphically here, reveal that women are not only less likely than men (p<.01) to agree that USF promotes understanding of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people, but they are also less likely than men (p<.001) to be satisfied with USF’s initiatives to encourage understanding of women. Although these differences between men and women reach statistical significance, because the difference in mean scores is approximately .30, we can conclude that these differences are of minimal importance. [In general, using Cohen’s (1977) approach, any difference in mean scores between groups
(e.g., between men and women) of approximately .35 (or .35 of a standard deviation) is minimally important; a difference of approximately .50 (or .50 of a standard deviation) is moderately important; and a difference of .67 or greater is very important. We suggest that readers use this as a guide when examining the tables.

Racial Differences

Table 15 presents mean scores on these same question items (i.e., questions 1a - 1h) for people of various racial and ethnic groups. The first observation that stands out is that the majority of racial and ethnic minorities agree that USF is doing a good job promoting understanding of various racial and ethnic groups. Every racial and ethnic group, with the exception of those of Arab or Middle Eastern descent, leans toward the agreement side (i.e., above 3) of the five point scale. Even Arab or Middle Eastern faculty and staff tend to agree that USF promotes understanding of many groups, but they tend to disagree that USF promotes better understanding of three groups in particular – people of different economic backgrounds (mean=2.93), of different religions (mean=2.71), and of different political beliefs (mean=2.86). Arab or Middle Eastern respondents were also less than favorable about USF’s ability to increase understanding of people whose native language is not English.

Analysis of variance procedures (or ANOVA’s) were employed to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences in mean scores across various racial and ethnic groups. Results, although not reported graphically here, show that there are differences across racial/ethnic groups in mean scores on four of the five items contained in this first question of the survey instrument. Specifically, race groups differed in their assessment of whether USF provides opportunities that promote better understanding of people of different economic backgrounds (p<.05), of different religious backgrounds (p<.05), of racial and ethnic minorities in general (p<.001), and of women (p<.05).

To determine which groups were most different on these measures, post hoc tests of differences among means were employed. Here, we find that Arab/Middle Eastern respondents are less likely than White, Asian, and Hispanic respondents to believe USF promotes understanding of people of different religious backgrounds (p<.05), and they are less likely than Native Americans and Whites to believe USF enhances understanding of racial and ethnic minorities. These findings reinforce the findings presented above indicating that Arab/Middle Eastern respondents rate USF much lower on these dimensions than do many other groups.

Similar post hoc tests revealed that Blacks are less likely than Native Americans, Hispanics, and Whites to feel that USF promotes understanding of racial and ethnic minorities (p<.05), and Blacks are slightly less likely than Whites to think USF promotes understanding of women (p<.05).

In sum, it is clear that respondents’ ratings of USF’s efforts to foster understanding of diverse groups is, in part, dependent on the gender and race of the respondent him/herself. What stands out most clearly are the differences between Blacks and other
race groups in their evaluation of USF’s efforts to promote understanding of racial and ethnic minorities, and the low ratings respondents of Arab/Middle Eastern descent give for USF’s efforts to enhance understanding of different economic, religious, and political backgrounds and beliefs. This latter finding is not at all surprising in light of the events of September 11, 2001, and the aftermath.

Other Differences

Similar analyses as reported above were performed in which mean scores were compared across other types of background variables, such as sexual orientation and disability status. To report the breadth of these analyses in graphic form here would require many additional pages. A few observations are in order, however.

By and large, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals – like their heterosexual peers – tend to agree that USF is doing a good job of promoting understanding of diverse groups. Interestingly, however, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, in comparison to heterosexuals, rate USF slightly lower on all of the items in this series (i.e., questions 1a - 1h) except the final two – USF’s efforts to promote understanding of racial and ethnic minorities and women. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual’s lowest rating went to USF’s efforts to promote understanding of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people, which is the only item gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents rated less than 3 (i.e., the midpoint of the scale), indicating an overall level of disagreement that USF has done enough on their behalf. The mean score of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on this item (2.83) was significantly less than the heterosexual mean score of 3.37, a mean difference of .54 at the p<.001 level.

People with disabilities, in general, are not unlike those without disabilities in their ratings of USF’s efforts to promote understanding of different groups. In fact, the only item for which people with disabilities report slightly lower levels of agreement is the statement concerning people with disabilities. In responding to the statement “USF provides opportunities that promote better understanding of people with a disability,” those with disabilities are slightly more likely to disagree than those without a disability (mean of 3.48 vs. 3.73; p<.05).

Are USF employees comfortable being around diverse groups? (Questions 2, 3a - 3e)

As Tables 14 and 15 show, respondents to the survey, in general, agree that it is easy at USF to get to know people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. A full 72.4% of respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement “At USF getting to know people with racial/ethnic backgrounds different from my own has been easy.” It is not surprisingly, therefore, that the overall mean score on this question item is 3.62. What’s particularly noteworthy and positive about the data on this specific question item is that the level of agreement does NOT systematically vary across the sexes, racial and ethnic groups, between people of different sexual orientations, or between those with – and without – a disability. In other words, people of different sexes, races and ethnicities, sexual orientations, and disability status share virtually the same level of ease in getting to know people of different races on this campus.
Ease in getting to know people of diverse backgrounds is one thing. Being comfortable sharing the same work environment is sometimes another. When asked the questions in the series 3a - 3e, “I would feel comfortable being a coworker with someone who is....” [African American/Black; Latino/Hispanic; Asian/Asian American; Disabled; Openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual], respondents in general indicate very high levels of agreement/comfort, with mean values approximating the maximum score of 5. As Table 14 shows, of all the items that compose question #3 of the questionnaire, comfort in being a co-worker with someone who is openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual received the lowest mean score of 4.29. Clearly, being a colleague of an openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual person appears to be least attractive for respondents, with a total of 7.5% of respondents disagreeing with the statement “I would feel comfortable being a coworker with someone who is openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual.” It is not surprising, therefore, that one respondent in commenting on this question stated: “Considering the number of times I've heard antigay cracks by my colleagues, I certainly wouldn’t want to be, say, an untenured openly gay faculty member.”

Respondents also sometimes report that they would feel uncomfortable having a co-worker with a disability, but they often qualify this judgment with statements like the following that appeared in the qualitative data: “I selected that I would not be comfortable working with someone with a disability because I sense I would tend to overcompensate to try and help them or insult them when I am unaware of how I can be in tune with the disability.”

Gender Differences

As Table 14 illustrates, men and women share virtually the same high level of comfort with diverse co-workers. There are no significant differences between the sexes in their comfort being around diverse colleagues.

Racial Differences

Perhaps where we see the most variability in comfort levels with diverse employees is between the different racial and ethnic groups. A couple of the results presented in Table 15 are worth noting.

♦ Black and Middle Eastern respondents are slightly less comfortable than Whites with having a Latino/Hispanic co-worker (p<.05).
♦ Black, Asian, and Middle Eastern respondents are slightly less comfortable than Whites in having an openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual co-worker (p<.05).

The former finding is corroborated to some extent in the qualitative data, where we find a staff respondent stating that “...there is conflict between African Americans and Hispanics here at USF, specifically in the lower pay range positions.” The latter finding – lack of comfort with openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual colleagues – might be attributable to the cultural backgrounds of the respondents reporting discomfort. Asian and Arab
American respondents, it could be argued, might retain many of the beliefs and values of their countries of origin. Because people in many Asian and Middle Eastern countries are less likely to encounter people who are open about their sexual orientation, exposure to such individuals at USF, or at any other place, could cause some discomfort.

Other Differences

Gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents -- whose mean scores on these question items commonly exceeded 4.8 -- report being slightly more comfortable around diverse colleagues than their heterosexual peers (p<.01). Also, in comparison to respondents without disabilities, people with disabilities report being somewhat less comfortable with co-workers who are openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual (mean=3.92 vs. 4.31, p<.05).

**Do USF employees feel accepted at the university and in their work units? (Questions 4 and 5)**

In order to evaluate whether employees felt accepted at the university and in their work units, faculty and staff were asked to state their agreement with two statements: question 4 “The climate at USF in general is accepting of who I am,” and question 5 “The climate in my immediate work environment is accepting of who I am.” Table 14 shows that respondents in general report strong feelings of acceptance at both the university level (mean=3.87) and the level of their work unit (mean=4.11). It’s not surprising that people’s feelings of acceptance are higher in their immediate work environment than at the university in general because such feelings tend to be generated in more close-knit groups. As before, independent sample t-tests were conducted to examine whether any significant group differences emerged in mean scores on these question items.

Gender Differences

As Table 14 reports and t-tests confirm, men and women are virtually alike in their feelings of acceptance at USF; that is, there were no significant differences between men and women at the p<.05 level. Both men and women report high levels of agreement with these question items, with both groups feeling slightly more accepted in their immediate work environments than at the university in general.

Racial Differences

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques reveal that both Black and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents are less likely than Whites to report feeling accepted both at the university (p<.05) and in their immediate work environments (p<.05). As Table 15 shows, on a scale from 1-5 (with 5 being the highest level of agreement/acceptance), Middle Eastern respondents have the lowest mean scores on these two items (3.23 and 3.42, respectively), followed by Blacks (3.41 and 3.71, respectively). The highest mean scores are among Whites (3.95 and 4.18, respectively), Asians (3.88 and 4.2, respectively), and Native Americans (4.0 and 4.36, respectively).
Other Differences

Feelings of acceptance at USF also appear to differ for those of different sexual orientations and disability statuses. In comparison to heterosexuals, gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents have significantly lower mean scores on feelings of acceptance at the university (3.35 vs. 3.92, p<.001) and on feelings of acceptance in their work environments (3.77 vs. 4.15, p<.001). Similarly, in comparison to those without disabilities, those with a disability have slightly lower ratings on feelings of acceptance at the university in general (3.58 vs. 3.87, p<.05) and in their immediate work environments (3.85 vs. 4.12, p<.05).

**Does USF have visible leadership and support for diversity and multicultural understanding? (Questions 8, 9, 10, and 17)**

In order to evaluate whether employees believe USF has the leadership and support necessary to foster diversity on campus, particularly with respect to racial/ethnic/national diversity, respondents were asked to report their level of agreement with a series of statements: question 8 “USF has visible leadership from the president and top administration to foster diversity on campus,” question 9 “USF is taking sufficient steps to support racial/ethnic/national diversity among the faculty/staff,” question 10 “USF is taking sufficient steps to support racial/ethnic/national diversity among the students,” and question 17 “USF provides sufficient activities to promote multicultural understanding.”

Table 14 shows that more respondents agree with the statements than disagree, as reflected in the mean scores of 3.37, 3.38, 3.55, and 3.40, respectively. Each of these mean scores is above the neutral value of 3, thus indicating that these statements elicited more agreement than disagreement.

Based on the mean scores on questions #9 and #10, respondents voice the highest level of satisfaction with USF’s support of diversity among students (mean=3.55). In fact, staff scores (mean=3.57) and faculty scores (mean=3.49) on this measure are virtually identical; both groups tend to agree that USF is taking sufficient steps to support racial/ethnic/national diversity among students. Staff are somewhat less satisfied with efforts to promote diversity among staff (mean=3.43), and faculty are even less satisfied with efforts to promote diversity among faculty (mean=3.26).

The higher standard deviations on these measures (as compared to many of the other questions on the questionnaire) suggest a high degree of heterogeneity of opinion among USF employees. Clearly, there are many who voice strong levels of agreement with these various statements, but there are many others who voice strong levels of disagreement. What are the sources of this heterogeneity? Comparing the scores of various subgroups helps to identify the sources of variation in opinion. Ultimately, however, it is necessary to examine the qualitative results -- that is, respondents’ answers to open-ended questions -- to fully understand the dimensions of variation in attitudes.
Gender Differences

As Table 14 reports, gender differences on these measures are virtually non-existent. In fact, the only measure for which men and women appear to be different is with respect to the statement “USF has visible leadership from the president and top administration to foster diversity on campus.” Even here, though, the difference is too slight (3.36 vs. 3.40) to be registered as important.

Racial Differences

Race appears to be a more significant factor than gender in accounting for the variation in attitudes on these questions of leadership and USF’s support for diversity and multicultural understanding. Table 15 and the analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques upon which it is based reveal significant differences across racial groups on all four of these measures (p<.01). As before, to determine which groups were most different on these measures, post hoc tests of differences among means were employed. Here, we find that Arab/Middle Eastern respondents and Blacks are the least likely to agree either that USF has visible leadership (2.58 and 3.17, respectively) or that it is taking sufficient steps to foster diversity (2.77 and 2.96, respectively), and because their mean scores on these items drop below 3, there is more dissatisfaction than satisfaction among these two groups.

Specifically, post hoc tests revealed the following patterns:

♦ Although there were no statistically significant differences across racial groups in their opinion of whether “USF has visible leadership from the president and top administration to foster diversity on campus,” Arab/Middle Eastern respondents are the least likely to report agreement as is evident with their mean score of 2.58, which is the lowest of all the means scores obtained on these four question items.

♦ Blacks are significantly less likely than whites to agree that USF is taking sufficient steps to support racial/ethnic/national diversity either among the staff/faculty (2.96 vs. 3.48, p<.001) or among students (3.14 vs. 3.64, p<.001).

♦ Blacks are also less likely than whites to agree that “USF provides activities to promote multicultural understanding (3.06 vs. 3.47, p<.001).

It is perhaps because of these patterns that both Black and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents are also less likely than other racial and ethnic groups to report that they “would recommend USF as a place welcoming of diverse people” (question #7). Of all the racial and ethnic groups represented at USF, Blacks and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents are clearly the least satisfied with efforts to foster a diverse and inclusive campus atmosphere, and these findings are corroborated with the qualitative data in the campus climate survey.
What is most evident in the qualitative data with respect to this issue is the perceived chilling effect of the two most highly publicized controversies at USF over the last few years -- the situation of former Professor Sami Al Arian and the racial discrimination lawsuit against the former coach of the women’s basketball team. Several respondents indicate that these events have had a negative influence on the climate for Arab/Middle Eastern and Black members of the USF community. Consider the following statements voiced by a couple respondents:

I actually see the climate worsening in all of these areas. I would recommend this as a work place to those who I felt were strong enough to handle things on their own more so than the climate of the institution. I am often surprised at some of the racism I witness on various levels on this campus... in word and deed.

While USF did not force a mediocre settlement on the basketball players for its role in causing the students and others pain and suffering, failing to advocate at any point on their behalf... was a sign of spitefulness and utter disrespect for the at large African American Community... The University will be judged on these matters by its actions and demonstrated commitment to diversity by reviewing the facts. What is USF’s record with hire, retention, promotion, pay, and tenure of blacks? Is there salary equity in the compensation of blacks when compared to their peers who perform comparable work?...Demonstrated commitment comes by both word and deed.

Clearly, some members of the USF community believe that the campus climate is worsening for racial and ethnic minorities and attribute this largely to the handling of these high-profile cases. Although this theme is not pervasive throughout the qualitative data (suggesting that it is a minority who feel this way), it is nonetheless apparent.

Other Differences

Respondents’ attitudes about USF’s leadership and support for diversity and multicultural understanding also appear to differ somewhat for those of different sexual orientations and disability statuses. In comparison to heterosexuals, gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents are somewhat less likely to say that they “would recommend USF to friends or colleagues looking for a work environment that is welcoming of people with diverse backgrounds and beliefs” (3.35 vs. 3.81, p<.05). Although gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents also voice slightly lower levels of agreement with the other question items measuring USF’s support for diversity and multicultural understanding (i.e., question #8, 9, 10, and 17), none of these differences reaches statistical significance, indicating that we can’t be sure that the differences aren’t just due to chance. Similarly, although those with disabilities report slightly lower levels of agreement to these statements than those without disabilities, none of the differences reaches statistical significance. Clearly, although gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents as well as people with disabilities have concerns about the campus climate at USF, those concerns are not reflected in these
question items that pertain mainly to USF’s support for racial/ethnic diversity and multicultural understanding. The only area where the gay, lesbian, and bisexual population expresses differences with the larger heterosexual population is in terms of their willingness to recommend USF to those looking for a work environment welcoming of people with diverse backgrounds and beliefs.

Qualitative Findings: Support and Reservations for Pro-Active Strategies to Support Diversity

When respondents were asked in question 20 if they “wish to comment on or clarify [their] responses to any of the above questions” (referring to questions 1-19), many respondents volunteered answers that specifically addressed these issues of leadership and support for diversity and multicultural understanding. As with any open-ended question on a survey, those who took the time to provide in-depth responses to this question are the ones who tend to feel strongly one way or the other about the issues involved. In other words, the qualitative data solicited by this (and other) open-ended questions are the best sites for observing more extreme views and opinions on both sides of the spectrum.

It is not surprising, therefore, to observe in these qualitative data both strong opinions that the university is not doing enough to promote diversity, as well as firm sentiment against USF’s current efforts to promote diversity. A careful content analysis of responses to this question reveals that some respondents would like to see the administration adopt a more proactive strategy in increasing diversity, as captured by the following statement:

I think USF does a fairly good job of accepting the diversity that someone brings to this campus - hence my generally favorable responses. What I find problematic… is that we don't seem to have a history of being particularly proactive in purposefully bringing diversity to campus, or in proactively promoting (to use the term in the question) diversity. My sense is that this is slowly beginning to change as evidenced in this survey.

One of the areas where USF needs to be particularly more pro-active, according to some respondents, is in assisting prospective students and employees from other countries. The obstacles encountered by some foreign-born members of the USF community are summarized in the following statement by a faculty respondent:

The university is fairly non-caring about its own foreign (diverse!) employees -- no help for visa applications/poorly organized international student office/the only advice they ever give is to call lawyers which cost by far more than a full time person to deal with H1b/green card issues would!!! Also foreign students often complain how tedious their procedures are...long waiting periods, every slightly "diverse" request to them yields the standard lawyer answer. If we want to become a "internationally recognized" diverse university, such issues need to be taken care of.
Clearly, statements such as this suggest that some respondents would like to see a more pro-active approach to bringing diversity to campus and in assisting international students.

Interestingly, however, one of the most frequently stated reactions to the first series of questions is that USF may actually be too focused on the pursuit of diversity. Of the 217 staff who responded to the open-ended question asking for additional comments, at least 25 (or 11.5%) stated something along these lines. Often the comments came in the form of simple statements like: “I think that diversity can go too far in this society where it seems that any group can lay claim to being different and want special recognition”; “If anything, USF makes too big of a deal over [these subjects]; perhaps at the expense of the majority”; or “The average American is sometimes neglected in our drive for diversity.” In many other cases, though, the respondents specified the reasons why they believe USF’s efforts to promote diversity are going too far.

The reasons why some respondents think USF’s efforts to promote diversity have gone too far appear to center on three major issues: the belief that the pursuit of diversity can result in the erosion of standards of performance; the belief that emphasizing group differences can cause divisions in the larger community; and the belief that the pursuit of diversity can result in reverse discrimination.

Those who mentioned that they believed diversity lowers standards of performance stated things like:

- There was no place [on this survey] to register my strong belief that we have gone way past what is reasonable and sensible in pursuit of the gods, tolerance and diversity. While opportunities and access must be provided, standards for performance and/or inclusion must be clearly defined and maintained.

- I believe we have gone too far with diversity, pushing it too much....Truthfully, USF goes too far in promoting cultural diversity to the point of forgetting about its other mission of education! We are an institute of higher learning.

About an equal number – though still a small minority -- of respondents to this open-ended question believed that an over-emphasis on diversity and multiculturalism could have the unintended consequence of causing division and separation in the larger USF community. Those who voiced this concern stated things like:

- I think sometimes in an effort to promote "DIVERSITY" we miss the point. While we should as an institution learn to be tolerant of diverse cultures and opinions, a sense of belonging is not developed by emphasizing differences, but by emphasizing unity: how am I LIKE my
brothers and sisters? (instead of how am I different).... Too MUCH emphasis on diversity fragments and creates islands of separateness.

The great separation of groups, i.e. Black Student Union, Hispanic Council, for example, seems to be creating more separatism than existed 30 years ago when we first started fighting for diversity and equal rights. Maybe it is time to integrate the diverse groups and celebrate our common needs and joys!

There was yet another segment of this group (i.e., the minority believing USF might be promoting diversity too much) whose rationale stemmed from a perception that USF’s pursuit of diversity has resulted in “reverse discrimination at USF.” Among this group, we see statements such as:

In my opinion, the university has literally bent over backwards to support “diversity,” so much so, that if you are white, Christian, and/or republican, you are treated inequitably. I experienced this as a student here, when in classrooms all opinions were welcome except conservative ones.

I think reverse discrimination is taking place at USF. This, in my opinion, negatively impacts white staff members and unfairly supports African American staff... There seems to be two sets of standards--with whites having to "tow the line" and blacks getting special treatment that is unfair....It also seems that perhaps due to the women's basketball team issue, USF has taken excessive measures to demonstrate that it supports African American staff.

Although it is impossible to estimate how widespread these kinds of opinions are in the larger USF employee population, one observation is in order: These kinds of comments reflecting some respondents’ beliefs that USF has gone too far in its pursuit of diversity are by far more evident among staff (A&P and USPS) than among faculty.

What kinds of recommendations do respondents make at this early stage of the questionnaire? Many respondents voice an interest in supporting the university’s efforts to promote diversity and multiculturalism, and they offer a number of suggestions to university administrators. Among the staff, these suggestions range from the need for additional presentations on diversity, to the adoption of more creative and inclusive diversity program initiatives, to diversifying the food service. “The foodservice is a monopoly that does not reflect the diverse tastes of our staff and students,” one respondent comments. “Dozens of local businesses could provide healthy food and various ethnic foods that would please most of the people here.” Another staff member states that “white members are often made to feel excluded [from diversity activities]” and suggests that more deliberate attempts be made to develop diversity activities which “white members would feel comfortable taking part in.” Yet another staff member states that USF’s current diversity activities seem to be “more for students than for staff,” and suggests broadening their focus a bit by “bringing some events to staff and the outlying
areas of USF and maybe uniting these events with the VA hospital” so that the university’s activities are seen as a part of the local community’s activities.

For the faculty, many of their suggestions for improving diversity and multicultural understanding focused on the curriculum, and here we see a desire among faculty for a stronger and more comprehensive international studies curriculum. In fact, of all the comments pertaining to the curriculum, the most commonly mentioned concern was the lack of an international perspective, which has created, in one respondent’s opinion, “a local, urban, and closed university.” As one faculty member shared, “The university needs more courses dealing with other areas of the world and their people; for example, we do not have a strong enough set of courses on Africa, Asia, Middle East. Possibly Latin America is adequately covered, but that would be the only area, and I am not even sure it is.” Another respondent seconded this recommendation by stating:

I believe that we need to greatly improve our curriculum in the area of international studies. USF should improve its foreign languages curriculum and hire more people in departments like history, political science, religious studies, etc. who specialize in different regions of the world (Asia, Middle East, Russia, Africa, etc.). In order to promote cultural understanding we need to improve our KNOWLEDGE of different people and cultures. USF should be more committed to an international studies curriculum. The problem of improving cultural understanding is not something that a diverse student body or faculty will alone solve. We need to improve our understanding of global history and world cultures. I wish that the USF administration would make this area of learning a priority. Students live in a global village now, and they need to improve their understanding of other civilizations in addition to their own.

This concern about cultural isolation was apparent not only among College of Arts and Sciences faculty but also among College of Education and the College of Medicine faculty. “I worry greatly that many of the students in the CoE come from culturally insular backgrounds and yet are joining a profession where they will have to adapt to cultural behaviors every day. We need to emphasize multiple cultural perspectives (ethnic, socio-economic, linguistic, etc) in our work for their sakes.” Or, as a professor in the College of Medicine points out: “we need help to teach medical students about diversity among the patient populations they are being trained to serve.”

These suggestions for increasing cultural sensitivity clearly extend beyond strengthening USF’s incorporation of international perspectives. Some faculty believe the curriculum should “highlight the contributions of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people,” incorporate “more on Muslim cultures,” increase understanding of “people with disabilities,” and adopt a “Native American studies program.” Others would like to see the adoption of “a general studies course as a requirement for all undergrads with an emphasis on diversity.” Still others believe that greater cultural sensitivity could be achieved through campus-wide presentations and lectures by people from the very groups whose inclusion the
university seeks to foster. As one respondent commented: “Consider the USF lecture series. There are a variety of topics presented by people from the majority white middle class. Are there Latino Art exhibits? Lecture series on Islam (presented) by someone from the Middle East? The psychology of hate crimes towards homosexuals (presented) by a homosexual? Hate crimes toward African Americans (presented) by an African American?... If these things are occurring, the word is not getting out.”

In sum, the responses to these question items about USF’s leadership and support for diversity and multicultural understanding reveal a wide array of opinions in the USF community. Although a small percentage of respondents believe the USF administration should be more pro-active, an equally small percentage, especially among the staff, believe the university has gone too far in supporting diversity. What must not be overlooked, however, is that the majority of respondents fall in between these more extreme positions, and that overall there are higher levels of satisfaction than dissatisfaction with the administration’s current efforts.

**Does USF foster the free and open expression of ideas? (Questions 11 and 12)**

Respondents’ evaluation of whether USF fosters the free and open expression of ideas cannot be understood apart from the historical events that immediately preceded the distribution of the climate survey in the fall of 2002. In particular, USF was in the midst of a heated public debate about whether a tenured professor in the computer science, former Professor Sami Al-Arian, had abused his rights of academic freedom and free speech. Although the details of this case (available at [http://www.usf.edu/news/](http://www.usf.edu/news/)) are well beyond the scope of this report, it’s important to acknowledge this event and evaluate the results of the campus climate survey in light of it. Because many of the facts underlying the case are open to competing interpretations, some people sought to defend former Professor Al-Arian from what they perceived as a violation of his rights to academic freedom and due process, while others defended the administration for what they perceived as its duty in ensuring the safety of the community and protecting against the abuse of academic freedom.

Although the campus climate survey was not designed to measure the climate of academic freedom at USF, two “fixed-response” questions on the questionnaire measured whether respondents believed the university fosters an environment for the free and open expression of ideas. The two questions on the survey are: question 11: “USF provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and opinions”; and question 12: “University officials should have the right to ban people with extreme views from speaking on campus.”

A large majority, 70% of respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement “USF provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and opinions” (mean=3.24). Approximately 30% of respondents either disagree (16%) or strongly disagree (14%) with the statement. A similar disparity of attitudes is evident in response to the question “University officials should have the right to ban people with extreme
views from speaking on campus” (mean=2.57), but here the distribution is more highly skewed in the direction of disagreement, with approximately 56% of respondents either disagreeing (24%) or strongly disagreeing (32%) with the statement.

Differences Based on Employment Classification

Independent sample t-tests comparing group means reveal that faculty express slightly lower levels of agreement than staff to the statement that USF provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and opinions (3.05 vs. 3.32, p<.001). Faculty are also less likely to agree that university officials should have the right to ban people with extreme views from speaking on campus. Clearly, faculty members respond to these questions based on their understanding of the university as a place where all ideas – even controversial ones – can have a hearing.

Gender and Racial Differences

The differences in mean scores between male and female respondents on these measures, as Table 14 suggests, are so small as to not reach statistical significance. Women are equally likely as men to agree that USF provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and opinions and that officials should have the right to ban people with extreme views from speaking on campus.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques were also employed to determine whether significant differences exist between various racial and ethnic groups in their responses to these question items. Previous studies of campus climate at American universities (Dey and Hurtado 1996, Jennings 1993) suggest that because some minority faculty and staff might equate “extremism” with racism (e.g., extreme views such as those held by the Ku Klux Klan), these groups may be more likely than white faculty and staff to support the administration’s right to ban extreme speakers from speaking on campus. The results of ANOVA tests on the USF Campus Climate Survey reveal that the same tendency, if evident at all at USF, may only be operative with Arab/Middle Eastern respondents. On both question items #11 and #12, the various racial and ethnic groups are not significantly different from each other in their responses. The only exception to this was for Arab/Middle Eastern respondents. Middle Eastern respondents are less likely than Whites to report believing that “USF provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and opinions” (means=2.23 and 3.3, respectively), and to report agreement that “university officials should have the right to ban people with extreme views from speaking on campus” (means=1.92 and 2.56, respectively). This result is understandable in light of the controversy surrounding an Arab American faculty member, whose rights to free speech, in some people’s minds, had been threatened.

Other Differences

Respondents’ attitudes about the climate of free and open expression of ideas at USF also appear to differ for those of different sexual orientations and education levels. In comparison to heterosexuals, gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents are less likely to
agree both that USF provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and opinions (mean values = 3.29 vs. 2.75, p<.001) and that university officials should have the right to ban people with extreme views from speaking on campus (2.59 vs. 2.26, p>.05). Also, those with higher levels of education, particularly those with post-graduate degrees, are less likely than respondents with lower levels of education to agree with these two statements.

Where do the Major Differences Lie?

Because the above analyses revealed a number of factors associated with respondents’ perceptions of the USF environment in terms of the free and open expression of ideas, multiple regression analyses were performed to determine which of these various factors – employment classification, race, sexual orientation, and education level – was most significant in predicting respondents’ opinions. These analyses revealed that once education level is controlled, the significant positive relationship observed between employment classification and perceptions of academic freedom is diminished. In other words, what really explains the apparent association between employment classification (faculty vs. staff) and perceptions of academic freedom is the education level of the respondent rather than employment classification. Furthermore, these same analyses reveal that having a post-graduate degree, being Middle Eastern/Arab, or being gay, lesbian, or bisexual are equally likely to diminish one’s satisfaction with the campus environment in terms of the free and open expression of ideas. What other factors besides educational attainment, race, and sexual orientation, though, might explain such perceptions? Qualitative analysis is necessary to uncover the full range of factors influencing respondents’ opinions on this issue.

Qualitative Findings: The Need for Restrictions on Certain Forms of Speech

When respondents were asked in question 20 if they “wish to comment on or clarify [their] responses to any of the above questions” (referring to questions 1-19), many respondents volunteered answers that specifically addressed these issues of the free and open expression of ideas and opinions. For quite understandable reasons, most of the responses related to the case of former Professor Sami Al-Arian, and these responses ranged from very strong opinions in support of, to strong opinions opposed to, the administration’s handling of the situation.

A careful content analysis of responses related to the Al-Arian case reveals two primary observations. First, of those respondents who chose to comment on the case, the majority were concerned that academic freedom may have been violated. Second, of those who voiced dissatisfaction with the administration’s handling of the case, respondents appear to be equally concerned with the issue of due process as with the issue of free speech.

Among the other comments related to issues of free speech were concerns about “hate speech” on campus, and where the university draws the line between free speech and speech that is offensive. Here, respondents made specific reference to the “uninvited
guests” who use the campus to broadcast their ideas of intolerance/hatred. One staff respondent, for instance, stated:

Question 23 [on the questionnaire] is unclear about who is making the extreme comments. If you are talking about professors, staff, students, and invited campus guests, then free speech includes extreme views up until the point of inciting violence or yelling "fire" in a crowded theater. However, I believe that the campus leadership should have the discretion to limit the ability of uninvited outsiders who are known to have inflammatory positions to speak on campus.

Another respondent offered additional advice on how to handle outside speakers who verge on hate speech:

Should a student, staff, faculty or other person affiliated with USF wish to speak out on a controversial issue, this should be fully permitted as long as they do not use or incite violence, physical or verbal, or show or distribute materials that would be inappropriate for those under 18 years of age, or abusive or degrading to anyone... Should any of the latter inappropriate behaviors occur, the person should be asked to climb down from his/her soapbox at the time of the incident, asked to leave the campus, asked before a committee, recommended to counseling center diversity training, or dismissed from the university for a short period - these in increasing order of measures to be taken upon each violation... If, however, a person who is not affiliated...with USF... wishes to come onto campus to speak on a controversial issue, they would need first to obtain permission from the university, which, once granted, may be revoked should any of the above-mentioned offenses occur. In place of ultimate dismissal from classes, the person may be charged with trespassing and restrained from coming onto campus property... If a member of a religious organization comes on campus and verbally abuses students, unprovoked, as they pass him/her on the way to classes, this would constitute a problem and a violation of students’ rights. Common sense and the “Your rights stop where my rights begin” adage would seem a good motto to follow.

Clearly, as the analyses presented above illustrate, understanding the climate at USF in terms of the free and open expression of ideas is complex. Any interpretation of the data must be placed in the context in which the survey was administered. At that time, USF was in the midst of a heated public debate stemming from conflicting interpretations about whether one of its faculty members had abused his academic freedom to achieve goals that conflicted with the mission of the university.

But concerns about the free and open expression of ideas at USF aren’t limited to this case. Although many respondents seem to have interpreted the questions on the survey as pertaining to this case, others voice concerns about less noticeable instances in which “free speech” crosses over into hate speech. Here, they suggest USF adopt clearer rules
to govern outside speakers as a way to curtail offensive and abusive speech that often deteriorates a climate of respect and inclusivity.

Do USF employees support the adoption of a domestic partner benefits policy? (Questions 14 and 15)

In order to evaluate whether USF employees believe the university should adopt a domestic partner benefits policy, faculty and staff were asked to state their level of agreement with two statements: question 14 “All campus policies that mention “spouse” or “family” (e.g., those covering spousal benefits, family illness, catastrophic leave, or bereavement) should be broadened to include domestic partners,” and question 15 “A campus-wide domestic partner benefits policy (e.g., including health benefits) should be adopted.” The “Total” column in Table 14 reports the mean scores on these questions items for all respondents to the climate survey. Recall that any score below a 3 represents a position of disagreement, and any score above a 3 represents a position of agreement, with the higher values being the most agreement. The value 3 is the neutral response (i.e., indicating “neither agree nor disagree”). As Table 14 illustrates, respondents report higher levels of agreement than disagreement with both questions 14 (mean=3.36) and question 15 (mean=3.37). These mean scores indicate that there is more support than opposition among the USF employee population for the adoption of policies that extend benefits to domestic partners.

Simply examining the means scores on these question items does not reveal the heterogeneity of attitudes on the issue of domestic partner benefits, however. Here, we must look at the distribution of responses as reflected in the standard deviations, which are reported along side the mean scores as an indicator of the average spread of observations around the mean. The high values of the standard deviations on these question items (1.395 and 1.412, respectively) indicate a very high degree of heterogeneity in opinions on this issue, higher in fact than any other questions in the first section of the survey questionnaire. Clearly, there is a segment of the USF population that believes strongly that a domestic partner benefits policy should be adopted, but there is also a segment that believes equally strongly that a domestic partner benefits policy should be opposed. Indeed, slightly more than half of all respondents to the survey reported support for the adoption or extension of a domestic partner benefits policy, and about a third voiced opposition to the policy. Interestingly, a significant percentage of respondents also take a middle ground by stating that they neither agree nor disagree with a potential extension of benefits to domestic partners. This latter finding will be explored further in the analysis of the qualitative data that follows.

Gender Differences

Independent sample t-tests were conducted to examine whether any significant group differences emerged in mean scores on these question items. As Table 14 reports and t-tests confirm, women are slightly more likely than men to agree that USF should not only broaden its family policies to include domestic partners (3.48 vs. 3.15, p<.001) but also
adopt a campus-wide domestic partner benefits policy (3.48 vs. 3.18, p<.001). Although men and women clearly express different levels of support for these policies, it is important to note that the level of support among both groups is higher than their level of opposition.

Racial Differences

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques reveal that significant differences exist between various racial and ethnic groups in their support of the adoption of domestic partner benefits policies, and the mean scores for each of these groups are reported in Table 15. Blacks are less likely than Whites (2.91 vs. 3.42, p<.05) to agree that “all campus policies that mention “spouse” or “family”... should be broadened to include domestic partners.” Blacks (mean=3.03) are also less likely (p<.05) than either Whites (mean=3.41) or Hispanics (mean=3.51) to agree that “a campus-wide domestic partner benefits policy (e.g., including health benefits) should be adopted.”

Other Differences

Levels of support for a domestic partner benefits policy at USF also appear to differ for those of different employment categories, ages, and sexual orientations. Among the various employment categories represented in the survey, faculty reported the highest level of support for both the broadening of existing policies (mean=3.54) and the adoption of a campus-wide policy (mean=3.59), followed by A&P and then by USPS. Mean scores for A&P on each of these two measures were 3.29 and 3.30, and for USPS they were 3.14 and 3.13. Clearly, the most significant difference across employment categories is between faculty and staff (whether A&P or USPS), rather than between A&P and USPS.

Among the various age categories represented in the survey, the youngest category of employees (i.e., those in the 13-30 year-old range) voiced the highest levels of support for domestic partner benefits, followed by those in the 31-40 age category, then by those in the 41-50 age category, the 51-60 age category, and finally the 61+ age category. On questions 14 and 15, the youngest age category had mean scores of 3.76 and 3.78, the next oldest had mean scores of 3.53 and 3.57, the next oldest 3.28 and 3.28, and the next oldest 3.25 and 3.25. Interestingly, of all the age categories represented in the survey, only those who are 61 or older had mean scores that came close to the neutral score of 3 on question items 14 (where their mean was 3.01) and 15 (where their mean was 3.05), but even with this age category, there appears to be more support than opposition. As these findings illustrate, every age category expressed more support than opposition for a domestic partner benefits policy, with the oldest being the least supportive and every succeeding generation displaying a higher level of support than its predecessor.

Gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents voice higher levels of support than heterosexuals for a domestic partner benefits policy. Here, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals voice more agreement not only that existing campus policies be broadened (4.40 vs. 3.27, p<.001), but also that a campus-wide policy be adopted (4.43 vs. 3.28, p<.001). With mean scores
as high as 4.40 on these measures, the gay, lesbian, and bisexual population is certainly displaying a superlative level of support for a partner benefits policy, which one would anticipate given the importance of this issue for this particular population.

In sum, it appears that overall attitudes among USF employees toward the extension and adoption of domestic partner benefits are either neutral or favorable. Among the demographic variables represented in the climate survey, race, employment classification, age, and sexual orientation appear to be the strongest predictors of respondents’ attitudes toward domestic partner benefits. Blacks are less supportive than either Whites or Hispanics, USPS staff are less supportive than A&P staff who are, in turn, less supportive than faculty, and those over 60 years-old are less supportive than every succeeding generation. Not surprising, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals reported the highest levels of support for domestic partner benefits, far surpassing their heterosexual colleagues in calling for the adoption of such policies.

Although each of these demographic variables helps to explain some of the variation in attitudes on domestic partner benefits, they don’t explain everything. As we mentioned previously, almost a third of respondents to these questions voiced a level of opposition, and if such opposition stemmed primarily from the demographic variables examined above, then we would expect to see higher levels of opposition among some of these demographic categories than we currently do. Instead, we find that even the categories of respondents who expressed lower levels of agreement (e.g., staff, those in their advanced years, heterosexuals, etc.) still expressed overall levels of support, as can be seen by their mean scores exceeding the neutral value of 3. This suggests that in order to fully understand the reasons for some respondents’ opposition to domestic partner benefits, one must look beyond the demographic characteristics of these respondents and examine the content of their responses to the open-ended or free-response questions that appear at the end of the various sections of the questionnaire.

Qualitative Findings: Reasons Underlying Competing Opinions on the Issue

When respondents were asked in question 20 if they “wish to comment on or clarify [their] responses to any of the above questions” (referring to questions 1-19), many respondents volunteered answers that specifically addressed the issue of domestic partner benefits. As we might expect based on the high degree of heterogeneity of responses to questions 14 and 15, the qualitative comments ranged from very strong opinions of support, to very strong opinions of opposition, with some respondents voicing opinions of neutrality.

A careful content analysis of responses related to domestic partner benefits policies reveals a few primary observations:

♦ Some respondents who indicated that they “agreed” or “agreed strongly” with the extension of benefits to domestic partners stated that their opinion was based largely on such things as: the need to bring USF in line with many other colleges and universities throughout the country so the university can enhance its capacity to
attract the highest quality faculty and staff; and the need to end what they see as essentially discriminatory practice.

Those who believed the policy should be adopted to bring the university in line with other colleges and universities shared statements like:

Such benefits should be extended to domestic partners of the same sex and to domestic partners of different sexes. Many colleges and universities around the country have adopted such policies to include domestic partners. I see no reason why USF cannot learn from their successes and incorporate similar policies.

USF urgently needs to adopt domestic partner recognition and benefits for faculty, staff, and students. We lag far behind many top class research universities in this regard. Not having a clear statement in the anti-discrimination policy and not offering domestic partner benefits suggests that USF is not supportive of its gay and lesbian faculty, staff, students, etc.

Not to adopt such policies could limit opportunities for USF faculty and staff and limit the university’s ability to attract valuable researchers and employees to USF and the Tampa area. There are many good reasons to take this step, and no legitimate or morally justifiable reasons not to.

Those who believed that not having a domestic partner benefits policy is discriminatory stated things like:

The very fact that every gay employee at USF subsidizes the health insurance and other benefits for heterosexuals' spouses and families is blatantly discriminatory.

I believe it is of paramount importance that all USF benefits (including health benefits) be extended to domestic partners, as though they were married or had the same status as married couples.... Not to do so is to continue a practice that is essentially discriminatory; to fail to take a leadership role in the academy and the broader community.

♦ Some respondents who indicated that they “disagreed” or “disagreed strongly” with the adoption of a domestic partners benefits policy stated that their opinion was based on such things as: their own personal religious beliefs and values; and the belief that such a policy would be too costly to the university. Consider the following statements of respondents:

I believe that society must draw lines of moral acceptability among the range of sexual behaviors that exist. It is right and good for society to have such standards. There are many who believe that homosexual behavior is
It’s not about civil rights. It is an issue of moral standards. It just isn’t appropriate for the University to put this issue in the same category as racial and cultural diversity. Nor is it appropriate to establish policy based on the sexual behavior practiced in private between two people.

...I don't want the state to spend its money on benefits/insurance for persons not married to a USF employee. The cost is too high, and I believe it will adversely affect the benefits for employees and their legitimate spouses.

Some respondents who indicated that they “neither agreed nor disagreed” with the extension of benefits to domestic partners stated that their neutrality on the issue was driven by what they regarded as the vagueness or generality of question items 14 and 15. Some of these respondents stated, for instance, that their opinion about the adoption of a domestic partner benefits policy would depend highly on the details of such a policy. Consider what the following respondents had to say:

I believe the term “domestic partner” needs to be clearly defined. Because married couples have a “binding” agreement, it is easy to expand benefits to them. I strongly agree that people in “binding” relationships where marriage isn’t permitted should be offered these benefits. However, precautions need to be in effect for short-term (boyfriend/girlfriend) relationships vs. a long-term partner.

I do think committed partners should have shared benefits, but I do not know how that definition is crafted. If I felt it to be equitable after learning more about them, I would readily support such policies. Right now, I just don’t know enough to answer one way or the other.

In light of these comments provided by various respondents to justify their positions on domestic partner benefits, it is clear that if the USF administration wishes to move forward in adopting domestic partner benefits, it must do so with attention to the various concerns raised by respondents. Currently, the majority of survey respondents voice neutral or positive attitudes toward domestic partner benefits. As the above comments suggest, it is reasonable to expect that many respondents who voiced neutrality on the issue will become more favorable once the details of a domestic partner benefits package are laid out. Although it is unlikely that those who have moral reservations with such policies will alter their opinions, others’ opinions might be swayed after receiving more information about the precise details, costs, and potential benefits of the policies. If it could be demonstrated that such policies would not incur any substantial, long-term costs, that they would be administered equitably (e.g., treating heterosexual partners the same as homosexual partners), and that they would actually benefit the university in certain key areas (e.g., enhance USF’s ability to recruit and retain top scholars), then the administration could move forward with this initiative with a greater degree of confidence. Obviously, demonstrating that the benefits of a domestic partner benefits
package exceed the costs will require a thorough review of other universities' experiences in this area.

V. Attitudes Relative to Diversity and Climate in Departments and Units

Attitudes with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusivity at USF are in part shaped at the level of departments and units. For this reason, the campus climate survey included both closed and open-ended questions concerning attitudes about these issues as they relate to the respondent’s immediate work environment. The second section of the survey, like the first, asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with a variety of attitudinal questions. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they strongly agreed (SA), agreed (A), neither agreed nor disagreed (N), disagreed (D), or strongly disagreed (SD) with 15 statements about the climate of their work unit. In order to examine respondents’ attitudes relative to these statements, these response categories (i.e., agree, disagree, etc.) were converted to numeric values, and as before, means were calculated for each question item. For all of these “likert scale” questions in which responses ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree, response categories were coded so that 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree. Thus, in evaluating mean scores, it is important to keep in mind that any score below a 3 represents a position of disagreement, and any score above a 3 represents a position of agreement, with the higher values being the most agreement. The value 3 is the neutral response (i.e., indicating “neither agree nor disagree”).

Although some of the questions in this section of the questionnaire were unique to staff, and others were unique to faculty, a total of five questions were the same or similar on both the staff and faculty questionnaires. Among the questions that were common to both staff and faculty were:

In my department or work unit.......  
- there is an active effort to recruit minorities.  
- senior employees treat junior employees equally regardless of gender.  
- it takes longer for minorities to prove themselves.  
- my chair/supervisor is fair in the allocation of work load.  
- my chair/supervisor is fair in evaluation of job performance.

Because these latter questions are the ones that are common across the staff and faculty questionnaires, analysis of the results will begin with these questions. As the “Total” column in Table 16 shows, most respondents to the survey indicate levels of agreement (i.e., mean scores exceed the value of 3) for each of these five statements. Among the five questions, the highest level of agreement is expressed with respect to the fairness of job performance evaluations (mean=4.10), followed by fairness in allocation of work load (mean=4.07). The least amount of agreement is expressed to the statements “It takes no longer for minorities to prove themselves” (mean=3.64) and “Senior employees treat junior employees equally regardless of gender” (mean=3.73). In fact, of all five measures, these latter two statements also generated the highest standard deviations,
indicating the greatest heterogeneity in responses. In other words, there are some segments of the USF employee population that disagreed or disagreed strongly that there is equal treatment in their work units with respect to minority status and gender, and further analysis of gender and racial/ethnic differences in responses may help to identify those segments.

**Gender Differences**

As Table 16 shows and independent sample t-tests confirm, women are only slightly less likely than men to agree with each of the five statements appearing in the table, and the differences are so slight that they do not meet Cohen’s (1977) criteria for being even minimally important. The one item which women appear to have slightly lower levels of agreement than men is the statement that “senior employees treat junior employees equally regardless of gender” (p<.001).

**Racial Differences**

As Table 17 shows respondent’s race/ethnicity is a more decisive factor in understanding attitudes toward the climate of his/her work environment. The same pattern that emerged in analyses of question items in the previous section are also evident here, with Blacks and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents sensing the least amount of equitable treatment in their work environment. Black, Hispanic, and Middle Eastern respondents are less likely than White respondents (p<.05) to agree that there is an active effort to recruit minorities during hiring in their departments/units. Black and Middle Eastern respondents are less likely than Whites (p<.05) to agree that senior employees treat junior employees equally regardless of gender. And in response to the final three statements in the Table, Blacks are the only group to manifest significantly different attitudes (p<.01) than all other racial/ethnic groups.

In sum, the pattern to emerge from these data is that certain racial and ethnic minority groups (i.e., Black, Hispanic, and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents) are less satisfied than Whites with the climate of diversity and fairness in their work units. Specifically, Black, Hispanic, and Arab/Middle Eastern respondents report lower levels of satisfaction than Whites in efforts to recruit minorities, and Blacks report lower levels of satisfaction than all other racial/ethnic groups in their supervisor’s allocation of work load and evaluation of job performance.

The fact that there are several other closed-ended question items in this section of the questionnaire, some specific to faculty and others specific to staff, means that the data gathered from these items could profitably be used by representatives of the Faculty Senate, USPS Senate, and A&P Council to further analyze the attitudes about the climate of the work environment for faculty and staff. The Faculty Senate, for example, might be interested in exploring levels of satisfaction with their colleagues’ willingness to mentor new faculty whose gender, race, or ethnicity is different from their own. Similarly, the USPS Senate and A&P Council might be interested in exploring levels of satisfaction
with their co-workers’ treatment of fellow staff and students whose gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and/or political beliefs are different from their own.

VI. Attitudes Relative to Morale

The effectiveness of any organization is closely tied to the morale of its staff. According to Zeitz (1983:1089), morale can be defined as “members’ affective or emotive responses to the organization – their general sense of well-being and enthusiasm for collective endeavors.” These emotive responses to the organization can be influenced by a number of personal and/or organizational factors, including gender and age differences, to length of service, occupational status and levels of rewards and recognition received (Gordon 1991).

The campus climate survey measured levels of morale among the faculty and staff on the Tampa campus by asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement with a variety of statements about job satisfaction. Specifically, respondents were asked to indicate whether they strongly agreed (SA), agreed (A), neither agreed nor disagreed (N), disagreed (D), or strongly disagreed (SD) with a total of eight statements about their satisfaction with such things as opportunities for advancement, performance evaluations, and distribution of merit. In order to examine respondents’ attitudes relative to these statements, these response categories (i.e., agree, disagree, etc.) were converted to numeric values, and as before, means were calculated for each question item. For all of these “likert scale” questions in which responses ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree, response categories were coded so that 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree.

Although a couple of the questions in this section of the questionnaire were unique to staff, and a couple others were unique to faculty, a total of six questions were the same or similar on both the staff and faculty questionnaires. Among the questions that were common to both staff and faculty were:

- I believe that if I were to take a leave from work for personal or family reasons it would not hinder my opportunities for advancement at USF.
- Staff members’ desires to balance family and job obligations has become problematic in my unit.
- I am satisfied with my opportunities for advancement at USF.
- I am satisfied with how performance evaluations are conducted in my unit.
- I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job (staff)/ I am satisfied with the distribution of merit increases in my department (faculty).
- I feel as though I belong in the USF community.

As the “Total” column in Table 18 shows, respondents to the survey indicated overall levels of agreement (i.e., mean scores exceeded the value of 3) for four of the six statements. Among the four questions receiving responses of agreement, the highest level of agreement is expressed with respect to feeling “as though I belong to the USF
community” (mean=3.62), followed by believing that “taking a leave from work for personal or family reasons... would not hinder... opportunities for advancement” (mean=3.51). More moderate levels of satisfaction were voiced with respect to “how performance evaluations are conducted” (mean=3.28) and “opportunities for advancement” (mean=3.08). The least amount of agreement (mean=2.97) was expressed to the statement “I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job” (as it appeared on the staff questionnaire) or “I am satisfied with the distribution of merit increases in my department” (as it was stated on the faculty questionnaire). Low levels of agreement were also voiced in response to the statement “Staff members’ desires to balance family and job obligations has become problematic in my unit” (mean=2.72), but because of the way this statement was worded, this score indicates that respondents tend to believe the balancing of family and job obligations is not too problematic in their work units. Clearly, then, respondents are least satisfied with either the recognition they receive for doing a good job or the way merit increases are distributed in their units. This finding is corroborated by some the qualitative data presented below.

Of all six measures or statements that appear in Table 18, the statements that generated the highest standard deviations, indicating the greatest heterogeneity in responses, were “I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job” (as it appeared on the staff questionnaire) or “I am satisfied with the distribution of merit increases in my department” (as it was stated on the faculty questionnaire) (S.D.=1.30), followed by “I’m satisfied with my opportunities for advancement” (S.D.=1.25), and then by “Staff members’ desires to balance family and job obligations has become problematic in my unit” (S.D.=1.23). In other words, these three statements appeared to produce less unified, or more extreme, responses. Clearly, although some segments of the USF employee population are satisfied with recognition for job performance, distribution of merit, and opportunities for advancement, there are other segments of the USF employee population that are dissatisfied with these aspects of their job, and further analysis of differences in responses based on employment classification, gender, and race/ethnicity may help to identify those segments.

Differences Based on Employment Classification

Because much of the extant research on employee morale (e.g., Zeitz 1983, Gordon 1991) finds that levels of morale are highly influenced by the employee’s degree of autonomy on the job, involvement in decision-making, and ability to perform non-routine tasks, one would expect that workplace morale at USF would be highly influenced by employees’ job classification as faculty, A&P, or USPS. Faculty are typically in positions that enjoy the greatest degree of personal autonomy and freedom to pursue non-routine tasks. A&P staff usually hold a variety of administrative and management positions, and because of the responsibilities associated with these positions, may exercise a certain degree of decision-making authority. The USPS staff, on the other hand, are typically assigned to professional, paraprofessional, administrative, clerical, secretarial, technical, service, or maintenance duties that carry neither autonomy nor decision-making authority.
As Table 18 shows and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques confirm, among the three employment categories, USPS employees report the lowest levels of satisfaction with opportunities for advancement, and they are most likely to believe that taking a leave from work might hinder their opportunities for advancement. Although faculty and A&P are virtually alike in their satisfaction with opportunities for advancement, USPS staff are less likely than either group (3.31 vs. 3.12 vs. 2.85, p<.001) to report feeling satisfied with opportunities for advancement. USPS are also slightly less likely than either A&P (3.32 vs. 3.55, p<.01) or faculty (3.32 vs. 3.69, p<.001) to agree that taking a leave from work would not hinder their opportunities for advancement at USF. The difference between A&P and faculty scores on this measure is not great enough to be considered statistically significant.

Table 18 also reveals that among the three employment categories, A&P staff are the least likely to perceive that staffs’ balancing of family and job responsibilities has become problematic in their unit, while faculty are the most likely to perceive this. In other words, faculty are more likely than either A&P (3.36 vs. 2.23, p<001) or USPS (3.36 vs. 2.44, p<.001) to report that the balancing of these responsibilities has become problematic.

One of the more noticeable findings reported in Table 18 is the low levels of satisfaction among faculty with the distribution of merit increases in their departments (mean=2.44). While A&P and USPS report similarly positive moderate evaluations of the recognition they receive for doing a good job (3.40 and 3.18, respectively), faculty are by in large dissatisfied with the distribution of merit increases in their department. This dissatisfaction with merit increases is also expressed in the faculty’s responses to the open-ended question at the end of this section of the questionnaire. Further analyses of these responses are presented below.

**Gender Differences**

As Table 19 shows and independent sample t-tests confirm, women’s levels of satisfaction differ slightly from men’s on one of the six question items assessing morale. Although both men and women tend to disagree that the “balancing of family and job obligations has become problematic” in their work unit, women are less likely than men to agree with this statement (2.57 vs. 2.94, p<.001), suggesting that men see the balancing of these two obligations as more problematic for their work units than do women. Although women also exhibit slightly lower levels of satisfaction than men with their opportunities for advancement at USF (3.02 vs. 3.21, p<.01) and with how performance evaluations are conducted (3.21 vs. 3.42, p<.001), neither of these differences is large enough to deem important.

**Racial Differences**

The results reported in Table 20 and Analysis of Variance techniques reveal that race/ethnicity is NOT a decisive factor in explaining varying levels of morale among the USF employees. Although Blacks’ mean scores on some of these measures are
somewhat lower than whites, none of these mean differences reaches statistical
significance, indicating that racial/ethnic groups are relatively alike in their levels of
workplace morale.

Other Differences

A variety of additional analyses were conducted to determine whether levels of morale
among USF employees were influenced by any of the other demographic variables (i.e.,
respondents’ sexual orientation, disability status, age, or number of years at USF)
contained in the survey data. The only noteworthy or statistically significant differences
across these groups in their scores on the six morale items are as follows:

Those with a disability are slightly more likely than those without a disability to
report feeling dissatisfied with their opportunities for advancement (2.76 and
3.11, respectively) and to believe that their opportunities for advancement would
be hindered by taking a leave from work for personal or family reasons (3.17 and
3.53, respectively).

Those in the 18-30 age category are more likely than every other age category to
report satisfaction with the recognition they receive for doing a good job (if they
are staff) or with the distribution of merit increases in their department (if they are
faculty).

Compared to those who have been employed at USF for 5 years or less, those who
have been at the university for 20 or more years report lower levels of satisfaction
(mean difference of .43) with the recognition they receive for doing a good job (if
they are staff) or with the distribution of merit increases in their department (if
they are faculty). This finding, at least among faculty, is probably an indication
of salary compression.

The fact that two of the closed-ended question items in this section on “Attitudes Relative
to Morale” are specific either to faculty or to staff means that the data gathered from
these items could profitably be used by representatives of the Faculty Senate, USPS
Senate, and A&P Council to further analyze the attitudes about workplace morale. The
Faculty Senate, for example, might be interested in exploring their colleagues’ levels of
satisfaction with their opportunities to develop as scholars and teachers. Similarly, the
USPS Senate and A&P Council might be interested in exploring their co-workers’ levels
of satisfaction with the training opportunities available to them, and whether they
perceive those training opportunities as contributing to their personal development.

In sum, the quantitative analyses of data gathered on attitudes to morale at USF reveal
that workplace morale is influenced by a variety of factors including employment
classification, gender, disability status, age, and length of time at USF. Satisfaction with
opportunities for advancement, for instance, is lower among USPS employees and those
with disabilities, while USPS employees and those with disabilities are among the groups
most likely to express fear that taking a leave from work might hinder their opportunities
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for advancement. Satisfaction with recognition for job performance/distribution of merit is lower among faculty, those who are older, and those who have been employed at USF for 20 or more years. Workplace morale does not appear to be influenced by other demographic characteristics such as race/ethnicity and sexual orientation.

Qualitative Findings

As a follow-up to the close-ended questions contained in the “Attitudes Relative to Morale” section, respondents were asked “If you are NOT satisfied with your current opportunities or position, please describe why.” Although the qualitative data gathered from this question are based on a more limited number of respondents and are largely anecdotal in nature, they do provide a more complete understanding of the issues affecting employee morale at USF. The results of the analyses of these qualitative data, which appear below, are reported separately for staff and faculty.

Staff Results

A total of 214 staff, or 18.7% of the 1,146 USPS and A&P employees who completed the survey, responded to the invitation to explain why they are NOT satisfied with their current opportunities or position. Responses to this open-ended question revealed four major reasons why some USPS and A&P employees are dissatisfied with their current opportunities or position. These might be summarized as: (1) Dissatisfaction with inequities in job position selection, promotion, and/or evaluation; (2) Dissatisfaction with pay and/or benefits; (3) Dissatisfaction with the adequacy of job training; and (4) Experience of discrimination or lack of respect.

The most frequently mentioned concern in both job classifications was the inequities they experienced in job position selection, promotion, and/or evaluation. This category included such concerns as lack of opportunities for advancement, the need to consider the equivalency of experience and education, and the effects of under-staffing. Comments representative of this category include:

I feel that there is no room for advancement in my unit because there is a lot of competition and office politics going on.

Because there has been so much reorganization and change in my unit, I feel knowledgeable, dedicated staff are overlooked for opportunities.

Work experience is not given the same recognition as having a degree even if the degree is not related to the job. The experience that I have enables me to train people in their jobs but the increases go to the people with a degree.

I love my job, BUT I believe the position should be upgraded, as should many others. We have all been asked to take on many additional complex tasks with little reward and no additional compensation except the very low raise we get every year.
Expectations are not unrealistic; however there is insufficient staff to handle the workload. Staff worry about the impact on performance and evaluation as a result of this shortage.

Other concerns among A&P and USPS staff, though somewhat less frequently mentioned, can be summarized as dissatisfaction with pay and/or benefits; dissatisfaction with the adequacy of job training; and experience of discrimination or lack of respect.

Representative of those who voiced dissatisfaction with pay and/or benefits are the following:

I do not think the pay allocation is necessarily representative of the work load, qualifications, or experience. Since our pay raises are limited by the state to a minuscule 2.5%, they are not based whatsoever on our performance. 95% of pay increases are across the board raises and do not depend on how well a person does their job.

The workload keeps growing due to growth in our unit, but the reward(s), either in terms of compensation or recognition, are not commensurate with the increase in expectations.

Since pay raises are usually either policy-based or non-existent, there is almost no reward for doing good work. Pay raises are across the board and not an incentive for performance.

Representative of those who voiced dissatisfaction with job training are the following quotations:

Training and career development opportunities are dispensed equally; the problem is that there is not enough budget allocated for it and often requires professional development to be paid out of personal pocket. In this environment, this dilutes income in that professional development becomes a requirement to maintain stature without advancement or any compensation for having done so.

Offers of training should be fairly offered and extensive.

My supervisor’s lack of comfortability in training staff impacts the skills that can be acquired... If the USPS has questions for clarification or if there are errors from misunderstanding of the task, my Supervisor will give the task to another USPS or will ask the USPS to work with another USPS to figure out the task. Instead of training or taking the time to accurately communicate how the task needs to be completed (which will help the staff gain skills for further tasks), my supervisor gives the work to someone else. It is easy to loose confidence in self with a supervisor who is uncomfortable with being able to communicate/explain how tasks need to be completed.
Finally, some staff attributed their dissatisfaction with their current opportunities or position to the experience of discrimination or unfair treatment in the workplace. Typical responses in this regard were: “I’m a women, and campus wide, we tend to be paid less than our male counterparts”; “I’m irked about the subtle gender discrimination in hiring and advancement”; “Favoritism and racial/ethnic bias play a major role in who gets a chance or opportunities for training and promotion”; and “Supervisors should be encouraged to show the same tolerance for staff family issues as they do for faculty family issues”.

Faculty Results

A total of 427 faculty, or 64% of the 667 faculty who completed the survey, responded to the invitation to explain why they are NOT satisfied with their current opportunities or position. Responses to this open-ended question revealed four major reasons why some faculty are dissatisfied with their current opportunities or position. These might be summarized as: (1) Dissatisfaction with pay and distribution of merit increases; (2) Dissatisfaction with workload and lack of adequate support staff; (3) Frustration with how bureaucracy interferes with ability to conduct quality research; and (4) Experience of discrimination or lack of respect.

The following quotations are representative of the comments of those who voiced dissatisfaction with pay and distribution of merit increases:

- Faculty salaries are too low and little has been done to address salary compression and bring the salaries of top faculty up to comparative levels nationally.

- My only complaint is that salaries do not keep up with performance and this affects morale in a negative way. I have published with top presses and in top journals, I have earned outside (national) grants, I have a teaching award, and yet my salary is comparable to that of a new hire who just received a Ph.D. That is simply unfair.

- My department’s merit raise formula weighs teaching performance over research and service performance, which favors faculty that do not have research assignments.

- In respect to evaluations in my department, I really wish peer evaluations of job performance were conducted externally. What seems to happen is that when evaluations are conducted internally, practically everyone gets favorable ratings, which means that the people who seem to do the bulk of the work aren’t sufficiently rewarded. And the people who do little or no work retain their same salaries.
Other faculty who responded to the open-ended question voiced dissatisfaction with the workload and lack of adequate support staff as having an influence on their job satisfaction. The following quotations are representative of this group of comments:

Tenure-earning faculty are so loaded with advising and teaching responsibilities that our research suffers... As long as the university continues to emphasize increasing enrollment in addition to Research I scholarly requirements for tenure earning faculty, the legislature will see no reason to back off on its demand for productivity as measured by quantity and not quality of instruction.

It seems like there are a lot of tasks completed by a small group of faculty in my department that really should be completed either by the office staff or by some of the more senior faculty who seldom make appearances on campus. Personally, I like to work on campus, but the down-side of working on campus is that the immediate day-to-day tasks fall to those people. Sadly, it seems like the best way to focus on the more research-oriented tasks associated with being a professor is to stay at home.

Extreme pressure is continually placed on a few of us and others are asked to do very little, if anything. I love my department. I love what I do, but there is far too much of a workload on some of the individuals.

For still other faculty, the overriding issue that influenced their satisfaction with their current opportunities or position was their frustration with how the bureaucracy interferes with their ability to conduct successful research projects. The following quotations are representative of this group of comments:

I am developing one of the best laboratories in the country, and even though... the money has been there, it is taking way too long to follow up with other departments such as purchasing and other bureaucratic entities. This of course is delaying my productivity which would enhance my own development, as well as the department’s, college’s, and university’s development.

They want us to get grants, but then place every conceivable obstacle in our way when we get them...Other major universities have entire staffs ready to help faculty write grants, do budgets, and generally get things going. USF has people who delay grant applications, mess them up, and actively discourage applications that don't bring in 45% overhead. Why isn't someone working on getting state contracts to deliver over 5%, instead of telling us they won’t sign off on them? You cannot expect people to apply for grants if there is no infrastructure, no support.

Some faculty, though not nearly as many as in the above three categories, cited their experiences of discrimination or lack of respect in explaining their lower levels of job satisfaction. The following quotations are representative of this group of comments:
Males are promoted to upper level positions throughout the department. Females who flirt are given preferential treatment. Women are considered second rate. It is soooo obvious everywhere to all the women.

I am a black man working within a white “old boy” system.

USF has no nondiscrimination policy regarding sexual orientation and no domestic partner benefits. As a university, it is not perceived as a welcoming environment to lesbians and gay men.

The qualitative findings presented above are the result of a thorough reading, though preliminary analysis, of the comments provided by respondents to the open-ended question following the series of specific questions about workplace morale. Although these findings present some of the major themes found in the qualitative data, the data gathered from this item could certainly be analyzed more systematically by counting the actual number of responses that fall under each of the themes presented above. Representatives of the Faculty Senate, USPS Senate, and A&P Council, in particular, might be interested in exploring these raw data further to garner an even more complete understanding of the forces that influence the workplace morale of their constituents.

**VII. Experiences at USF**

A full section of the campus climate survey was designed to gauge the frequency and nature of incidents and events on campus that run contrary to the university’s quest to create a welcoming, comfortable, and inclusive atmosphere for diverse populations. In order to measure the frequency and nature of these incidents and events, faculty and staff were asked to report on: the frequency with which they’ve heard insensitive or disparaging remarks about various groups of people; whether they’ve attended any events at USF where any particular groups would feel uncomfortable or unwelcome; whether they’ve ever witnessed any USF employee take advantage of a student; and whether they’ve ever personally been the target of harassment at USF. The following sections report the findings generated from this series of questions.

**Insensitive and Disparaging Remarks**

In order to assess the frequency and nature of the disparaging remarks heard about various groups of campus, respondents were asked: “Please indicate the number of times within the last year you have heard a student make an insensitive or disparaging remark about...”, which was followed by a listing of a variety of groups including gay, lesbian, or bisexual people; non-native English speaking people; people of particular economic backgrounds; people of particular religious backgrounds; people with particular political affiliation/beliefs; people with a disability; people of particular racial/ethnic backgrounds; women; and men. These questions were followed, in turn, by two nearly identical series of questions, but this time asking whether such remarks were heard from a university staff member or a faculty member or teaching assistant. Respondents were asked to
report the frequency of hearing such remarks using the rating guide: 0=Never; 1=Rarely; 2=Sometimes; and 3=Often.

Table 21 reports the mean scores, on a scale of 0-3, on these question items. Because we were interested in learning which particular groups are reported to receive the most disparaging comments, the table lists mean scores in descending order, from highest to lowest, with the highest mean scores indicating the most frequently targeted groups for insensitive remarks on campus.

The first thing one observes in looking at Table 21 is that all of the mean scores fall below the value of 1, indicating that most respondents report hearing these types of insensitive remarks either rarely or never. In comparing the mean scores, it appears that the most frequently heard comments relate to people with particular political beliefs, people of particular religions, of particular races/ethnicities, and people whose native language is not English. Interestingly, respondents report these types of insensitive comments coming slightly more frequently from students and staff than from faculty. Slightly less frequent are reports of hearing staff or students make insensitive or disparaging comments about women, men, and gay, lesbian, and bisexual people. And the group which appears least likely to be the object of disparaging remarks at USF are people with disabilities. Clearly, the data presented in Table 21 suggest that, at least in terms of reports of insensitive or disparaging remarks, the climate at USF is least welcoming and comfortable for people of particular political beliefs, religious affiliations, and races and ethnicities, and for those whose native language is not English.

Events Where Particular Groups Would Feel Uncomfortable

Respondents were also asked “Within the last year have you ever attended any college/university events where someone from the above referenced groups might have felt uncomfortable or unwelcome?” A full 87.4% of respondents reported that, within the last year, they have NOT attended any such events. However, a total of 212, or 12.6%, of the 1,683 respondents to this question indicated that they had attended such an event. What kinds of events did they describe? Among the events most frequently described were those perceived as being uncomfortable or unwelcoming for racial/ethnic minorities, gays, lesbians, or bisexuals, and people of different political affiliations.

Events and Situations Perceived as Uncomfortable for Racial/Ethnic Minorities

Many of those who attended events which they perceived as being uncomfortable for particular racial/ethnic minorities described events that would be uncomfortable for Arabs or Muslims. The most frequently described situations were ones in which inappropriate or harassing remarks were made about Arabs as a reaction to the events of September 11, 2001. Respondents referenced “a discussion group in which disparaging remarks were made about ‘Arabs’/Muslims;” “one of the president’s receptions” when “a faculty member made an insensitive remark/joke about Middle Eastern people and Muslims,” after which “a Muslim faculty member immediately left the reception;” “the candlelight vigil right after Sept. 11, which instead of bringing people together, began
with a pledge of allegiance that left many non-citizens feeling baffled and alienated at a time when they were there to show solidarity with the U.S.;” a public event at which prayers were “solely Christian based;” and a USF “football game” at which a “guy with a turban was harassed by a group of students.”

Besides these events, other respondents described various situations, though not as evident in the data, at which other racial/ethnic minorities would have felt uncomfortable. One respondent cited “instances where people have publicly questioned the abilities of people of color when affirmative action issues relating to faculty hires are discussed.” Another respondent described being “on a shuttle bus once and the driver was playing a talk radio channel very loudly. The radio commentator was making many disparaging remarks about people of many ethnic backgrounds, including African American, Indian, Asian, etc.” Still other respondents described situations in which Whites/Caucasians may have felt uncomfortable, such as when “events for ethnic minorities have had insensitive speakers speaking to the minority and ignoring the white people present,” or “Al Sharpton’s speech” on campus, which was perceived by one attendee as expressing “open hostility toward whites, particularly white men.”

*Events and Situations Perceived as Uncomfortable for Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals*

When respondents spoke of situations or events at which gay, lesbian, or bisexual people would feel uncomfortable, they usually spoke either of social events for which the invitation/announcement did not include an invitation for “significant others,” or social functions where gays, lesbians, and bisexuals themselves felt uncomfortable bringing their significant others. Among the responses that fell in these categories were: “Events sometimes include spouses but not significant others;” “Many gay and lesbian colleagues will not bring their partners to events for fear of harassment and discrimination in job promotions and work environments;” “there are no social events where same sex couples feel comfortable enough to dance or show affection.” Several respondents also mentioned instances of more overt harassment directed at gays, lesbians, and/or bisexuals: “A same sex domestic partner at a holiday party was questioned as to why there;” “A comedy event at the SEC where disparaging remarks were made about gay men;” and “Comments made by religious (preachers) allowed to preach on campus.”

*Events and Situations Perceived as Uncomfortable for People of Particular Political Affiliations*

Many of those who attended an event perceived as being unwelcoming for those of particular political affiliations referenced meetings or presentations at which politics became a topic of discussion. “Meetings where politics can become a topic produces snide remarks about conservatives,” voiced one respondent. Other respondents mentioned: “On the USF Talks listserv many individuals make crude and unacceptable remarks about the current government and Christians in particular;” “There have been several forums in which people of different political positions have attacked on another.”
Although only 12.6% of the respondents to the survey indicated they had participated in events where members of particular groups would feel uncomfortable, the descriptions these respondents provided make it clear that certain situations can occur, however unintentional, where people of diverse backgrounds feel uncomfortable at USF. In describing these events, many respondents call for greater attention to events, situations, and remarks that generate discomfort in general, but particularly among people of different races and ethnicities, among gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, and among those of differing political affiliations.

Employees Taking Advantage of Students
When respondents were asked whether they “have ever witnessed any USF employee (faculty or staff) take advantage of a student, research assistant, or teaching assistant,” 86.7% responded “no,” and 222, or 13.1%, of the 1,689 respondents to the question answered “yes.” Among faculty who reported such incidents, the most common report of mistreatment was an employee asking and/or expecting a graduate student either to work in excess of the contracted work load or to conduct menial work, personal work, or other inappropriate tasks. For instance, respondents report having witnessed staff members ask graduate students to “work for many more hours than they are paid,” “pick up mail for a professor,” “move household items for a faculty member’s family members,” “clean up the office,” “baby-sit,” “run errands,” and “picking up and dropping off dry cleaning” for the professor. Other forms of mistreatment were cited less frequently, including instances of sexual harassment of students, and not giving an appropriate level of credit for scholarship/writing done by graduate students.

Personal Experiences of Harassment
Of the 1,637 faculty and staff who responded to the question “Have you personally ever been the target of harassment at USF?,” a majority of respondents (1,226, or 74.8%) did not indicate being the recipients of any form of harassment at USF. However, some respondents (411, or 25.1%) report being the target of some form of harassment during their time at USF. Although this number appears somewhat large, in looking through respondents’ descriptions of the instances of harassment, it is clear that the instances cited range from some rather serious incidents (e.g., overt sexual harassment) to other, more benign events (e.g., verbal comments described as “mildly offensive”). Given this variety of responses and the fact that “harassment” was not clearly defined on the questionnaire, it is reasonable to conclude that this figure is based on a very broad understanding of “harassment” among the respondents, one that includes even mildly offensive remarks or the reading of graffiti on the wall.

The table below presents the number of respondents who reported having experienced each of the forms of harassment listed on the questionnaire. Although these data provide a general picture of the frequency of various forms of harassment experienced on the USF campus, the data do not accurately reflect the frequency with which each particular population is a target of harassment. To determine the latter requires that we (1) perform analyses that enable us to observe the demographic characteristics of those who reported
each type of harassment, and (2) convert the raw numbers into percentages based on the representation of different groups among the survey respondents.

As the table below illustrates, the form of harassment that affects the greatest number of USF employees overall is harassment based on gender, with 201 respondents indicating that they’ve experienced this form of harassment. Other forms of harassment affecting USF employees, listed in descending order, are harassment based on race/ethnicity (119), harassment based on age (100), class (74), political beliefs (64), religion (56), and sexual orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on Gender</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Age</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Class</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Political Beliefs</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Religion</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures must be balanced by observations of the demographic characteristics of those reporting the harassment, and by converting the raw numbers into percentages based on the representation of different groups among the survey respondents. Although performing these calculations for all of these groups is beyond the scope of this report (and in some cases limited by the lack of demographic data), some of the more significant observations are:

Of the 201 respondents who reported experiencing harassment based on gender, 142 are women and 49 are men (10 didn’t answer the gender question). Taking the figure of 142 and dividing it by the total number of women in the survey (i.e., 1019), we can determine that 13.9% of female respondents report having experienced some form of harassment based on gender during their time at USF.

Of the 119 respondents who reported experiencing harassment based on race/ethnicity, 40 are White, 35 are Black, 20 are Hispanic, 5 are Asian, 5 are multiracial, and 2 are Middle Eastern. Taking these figures and dividing them by the representation of the various racial groups in the survey population, we can see that 3% of Whites report having experienced harassment based on race/ethnicity, compared to 21.3% of Blacks and 17.5% of Hispanics.

Of the 40 respondents who reported experiencing harassment based on sexual orientation, 22 report being gay or lesbian, 2 bisexual, 3 non-identified, and 13
heterosexual. Taking these figures and dividing them by their representation in the survey population, we observe that 37.9% of gay and lesbian respondents report having experienced harassment based on their sexual orientation. (Other computations were not conducted because of the small number of respondents in the other categories.)

VIII. Attitudes and Experiences of Diverse Populations at USF

Attitudes and Experiences of Racial and Ethnic Minorities

The USF Campus Climate Survey contained a number of questions designed to evaluate the climate at USF for people who are racial or ethnic minorities. In the climate survey, the respondent’s racial/ethnic minority status was determined based on self-identification; respondents were asked “With which racial/ethnic group do you most identify? Black/African American/Afro-Caribbean/African, American Indian/Native American/Alaskan Native, Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander, Latino/Hispanic, Arab American/Middle Eastern, White/Caucasian, Multiracial, or Other.” All of those who did NOT indicate that they were White/Caucasian in the paper-and-pencil questionnaire, or who, in the online questionnaire reported that they were a person of color, were asked to respond to a series of questions about their experiences as a racial or ethnic minority on the USF campus.

Although a total of 423 respondents reported a non-White/Caucasian race or ethnicity, only 287 of these individuals (or 67.8% of non-White respondents) completed this specific section of the questionnaire intended for racial/ethnic minorities. This represents 15.7% of the total 1,827 respondents.

Those who identified as being a member of a racial or ethnic minority were then asked to report the frequency with which they’ve experienced the following situations within the last year. The question asked: “How often during the past year at USF have you:

.....felt the USF environment strengthened your own sense of racial/ethnic identity
.....feared for your personal safety because of your race/ethnicity
.....felt you needed to minimize an aspect of your racial/ethnic culture (e.g., language, dress) to be able to fit in
.....been put down intellectually because of your race/ethnicity
.....had someone challenge or attempt to embarrass you because of your race/ethnicity
.....had someone assume you were employed/promoted because of your race/ethnicity
.....felt that you were expected to speak on behalf of all members of your race/ethnicity
.....felt isolated or left out when work was required in groups because of your race/ethnicity
.....felt left out of a social event or activity because of your race/ethnicity
.....experienced some other form of discrimination because of your race/ethnicity
Respondents were asked to indicate whether they experienced each situation never (N), rarely (R), sometimes (S), or often (O). In order to analyze the results, the response categories themselves (i.e., never, rarely, etc.) were converted to numeric values in which 0=never, 1=rarely, 2=sometimes, and 3=often. Means were then calculated for each question item, and because the scale is a 4-point scale of 0-3, the values closest to 0 indicate low frequency and the values closest to 3 indicate high frequency.

Table 22 reports the results for each question item presented in descending order from the situation most often experienced by racial and ethnic minorities to the situation least often experienced. As Table 22 reports, racial and ethnic minorities at USF rarely if ever experience overt mistreatment while on campus due to their minority status. However, when they do encounter unpleasant or potentially offensive situations, it is usually in the form of either feeling like they are expected to speak on behalf of their minority group, or feeling a need to minimize some aspect of their culture in order to fit in. The most frequently encountered situation is feeling like they were expected to speak on behalf of their minority group (mean=.95). The second most frequently mentioned negative experience among racial and ethnic minorities is feeling a need to minimize an aspect of their culture in order to fit in (mean=.79). This was followed by experiencing another type of discrimination (mean=.75), being put down intellectually (mean=.61), feeling left out of a social event (mean=.57), having someone challenge or attempt to embarrass them (mean=.51), and feeling left out when work was required in groups (mean=.49). Hardly ever, though, did racial or ethnic minorities report being afraid for their personal safety because of their race or ethnicity.

These results indicate that although some racial and ethnic minorities experience various forms of mistreatment in the areas outlined above, the frequency with which these events occur is relatively low, as indicated by each of the mean values falling below 1. In other words, on average, racial and ethnic minorities at USF rarely if ever experience overt mistreatment while on campus due to their minority status, but when they do, it is usually in the form of either feeling like they are expected to speak on behalf of their minority group, or feeling a need to minimize some aspect of their culture in order to fit in.

Suggestions for Improving the Climate for Racial and Ethnic Minorities

All respondents to the survey were provided the opportunity to offer recommendations for improving the campus climate for racial and ethnic minorities. Specifically, respondents were asked: “Do you have any specific suggestions for how USF could improve the campus climate for racial and ethnic minorities?” Responses to this open-ended question revealed four major themes, which might be summarized in the following suggestions: (1) the need to either continue or improve dialogue between racial and ethnic groups on campus; (2) the desire to either continue or improve recruitment of racial and ethnic minorities; (3) the need to increase sensitivity and awareness of racial and ethnic differences; and (4) the call for offering events that raise multicultural awareness.
**Attitudes and Experiences of Women**

The USF Campus Climate Survey also contained a number of questions designed to evaluate the climate at USF for women. Of the 1,019 women who completed the survey, 975 (96%) completed the special section of the survey intended for women. These women were asked to report the frequency with which they’ve experienced the following situations within the last year. The question asked: “How often during the past year at USF have you:

- feared for your personal safety because of your gender
- been put down intellectually because of your gender
- had someone challenge or attempt to embarrass you because of your gender
- had someone assume you were employed/promoted because of your gender
- felt that your ideas/comments weren’t listened to as carefully as your male coworkers’
- felt that your work wasn’t valued as highly as your male coworkers’ work
- felt isolated or left out when work was required in groups because of your gender
- felt left out of a social event or activity because of your gender
- experienced some other form of discrimination because of your gender

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they experienced each situation never (N), rarely (R), sometimes (S), or often (O). In order to analyze the results, the response categories themselves (i.e., never, rarely, etc.) were converted to numeric values in which 0=never, 1=rarely, 2=sometimes, and 3=often. Means were then calculated for each question item, and because the scale is a 4-point scale of 0-3, the values closest to 0 indicate low frequency and the values closest to 3 indicate high frequency.

Table 23 reports the results for each question item presented in descending order from the situation most often experienced by female employees to the situation least often experienced. As Table 23 shows, although some women have experienced various forms of mistreatment due to their gender, the frequency with which women report these occurrences is relatively low, and somewhat lower than the reports of mistreatment among racial and ethnic minorities and among gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. Of the various forms of mistreatment that women were asked about, the most frequently encountered situation is feeling like their ideas weren’t listed to as carefully as their male co-workers’ ideas (mean=.61). The second most frequently mentioned experience among these female respondents is feeling like their work wasn’t valued as highly as their male co-workers’ work (mean=.53). This was followed by fear of personal safety (mean=.42), being put down intellectually (mean=.39), having someone challenge or attempt to embarrass them (mean=.35), experiencing some other form of gender discrimination (mean=.31), feeling left out when work was required in groups (mean=.26), and feeling left out of a social event (mean=.20). The situation which women encountered least frequently was to have someone assume they were employed because of their gender (mean=.13).
What stands out about these results is that although some women have experienced various forms of mistreatment due to their gender, the frequency with which women report these occurrences is relatively low, and somewhat lower than the reports of mistreatment among racial or ethnic minorities and among gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. Not only does each of the mean values fall below 1, but all of them, except two, fall below 0.5, indicating that most of these situations are only rarely if ever encountered by women on this campus.

Suggestions for Improving the Climate for Women

As in the previous section of the questionnaire, all respondents to the survey were provided the opportunity to offer recommendations for improving the campus climate for women. Specifically, respondents were asked: “Do you have any specific suggestions for how USF could improve the campus climate for women?” Analysis of the responses to this open-ended question revealed several major themes. Among the most common suggestions were: (1) improve security on campus to foster personal safety; (2) adopt a more liberal family leave policy; (3) diminish or eliminate salary disparities between men and women; (4) increase availability of affordable child care; (5) offer events that raise awareness of women’s issues; and (6) improve recruitment of women to administration, faculty, and staff.

Attitudes and Experiences of Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals

The USF Campus Climate Survey also contained a number of questions designed to evaluate the climate at USF for gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees. In the climate survey, the respondent’s sexual orientation or preference was determined based on self-identification; respondents were asked “What is your sexual orientation or preference? Bisexual, Gay/Lesbian, Heterosexual, or Non-identified.” Of the 1,623 respondents who were willing to answer this question, only a small minority indicated that they were gay, lesbian, or bisexual, and almost as many stated that they were “non-identified.” Fifty-eight (or 3.6% of those who responded to the question) indicated that they were “gay/lesbian,” 36 (or 2.2%) reported being “bisexual,” and 77 (or 4.7%) indicated being “non-identified.” A total of 1,452 (or 89.5%) of the 1,623 people who responded to the sexual orientation question reported being “heterosexual.”

Those who indicated that they were either gay, lesbian, or bisexual (a total of 94 individuals) were then asked to report their level of comfort in disclosing their sexual orientation/preference to friends, acquaintances, supervisors and co-workers. Respondents were asked to report whether they were not comfortable at all (N), slightly comfortable (S), moderately comfortable (M), or very comfortable (V). In order to analyze the results, the response categories were converted to numeric values in which 0=not comfortable at all, 1=slightly comfortable, 2=moderately comfortable, and 3=very comfortable. Means were then calculated for each question item, and because the scale is a 4-point scale of 0-3, the values closest to 0 indicate low frequency and the values closest to 3 indicate high frequency.
Table 24 reports the results for each question item presented in descending order from the group of people respondents feel most comfortable disclosing their sexual orientation/preference to, to the group of people respondents feel least comfortable disclosing to. As Table 24 reports, respondents feel most comfortable disclosing their sexual orientation to friends (mean=2.67), followed by acquaintances (mean=1.57), their supervisor (mean=1.45), and finally to their co-workers (mean=1.31). From these responses, especially the low mean scores for disclosing to co-workers, it’s clear that many gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents are uncomfortable sharing this information with colleagues in the work setting.

These questions, in turn, were followed by a series of questions asking about the frequency with which they’ve experienced the following situations within the last year. The question asked: “How often during the past year at USF have you:

.....felt the USF environment helped affirm your sexual identity
.....feared for your personal safety because of your sexual orientation
.....felt you needed to minimize an aspect of your sexual identity to be able to fit in
.....avoided disclosing your sexual orientation due to fear of negative consequences
.....had to conceal your sexual orientation to avoid intimidation
.....had a student challenge or attempt to embarrass you because of your sexual orientation
.....felt comfortable discussing your sexual orientation while on campus
.....felt that you were expected to speak on behalf of all gays, lesbians, or bisexuals
.....felt isolated or left out when work was required in groups because of your sexual orientation
.....felt left out of a social event or activity because of your sexual orientation
.....experienced some other form of discrimination because of your sexual orientation

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they experienced each situation never (N), rarely (R), sometimes (S), or often (O). In order to analyze the results, the response categories themselves (i.e., never, rarely, etc.) were converted to numeric values in which 0=never, 1=rarely, 2=sometimes, and 3=often. Means were then calculated for each question item, and because the scale is a 4-point scale of 0-3, the values closest to 0 indicate low frequency and the values closest to 3 indicate high frequency.

Table 25 reports the results for each question item presented in descending order from the situation most often experienced by gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, to the situation least often experienced. As Table 25 reports, of the various situations gays, lesbians, and bisexuals were asked about, the most frequently encountered was one in which they avoided disclosing their sexual orientation/preference for fear of negative consequences (mean=1.83). The second most frequently mentioned experience among this group was the need to minimize an aspect of their sexual identity in order to fit it (mean=1.73). This
was followed by feeling a need to conceal their identity to avoid intimidation (mean=1.18), feeling left out of a social event (mean=.87), feeling like they were expected to speak on behalf of the gay, lesbian, and bisexual population (mean=.80). The situations least frequently encountered were fearing for personal safety (mean=.65), feeling left out when working in groups (mean=.61), and having students challenge or attempt to embarrass them (mean=.46).

What stands out about these results is the relatively high mean scores on the question items dealing with the perceived need to conceal one’s sexual orientation. In comparison to other types of unpleasant situations, gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees are most likely to encounter situations where they either have to avoid disclosing this aspect of their lives, or worse, feel they need to conceal it. The lower mean scores on the other items indicate that although some gay, lesbian, and bisexual people experience some forms of mistreatment at USF, the frequency with which these occur is relatively low, as indicated by each of the mean values falling below 1. In other words, on average, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals at USF rarely, if ever, experience mistreatment due to their sexual orientation/preference while on campus. For some, this may be because they are not really “out” at work, but for others, it’s because they genuinely regard their work environment as one that is accepting of who they are.

**Suggestions for Improving the Climate for Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals**

As with the other groups on campus, all respondents to the survey were provided the opportunity to offer recommendations for improving the campus climate for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. Respondents were asked: “Do you have any specific suggestions for how USF could improve the campus climate for gay, lesbian, and bisexual people?” Among the most common recommendations made by those who answered the question were: (1) ensure security of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals who choose to disclose their sexual orientation; (2) provide domestic partner benefits; (3) offer events that foster dialogue and raise awareness and understanding of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people; and (4) recruit more openly gay people to top positions.

**Attitudes and Experiences of People with Disabilities**

The term disability refers to the pattern of behavior emergent from incapacity, i.e., the loss of ability to perform expected role activities because of a chronic physical or mental impairment (Harber and Smith 1971). Disability entails extensive and persistent behavioral consequences of impairment, which is distinct from any disease, injury or acute illness that does not limit required performance over an extended period of time. Usually, the capacity limitations from mental and physical impairment require special accommodations for the incapacity. For the person with the disability and the employer, this means establishing an agreement whereby the disabled employee is exempted from conventional work performance standards (Harber and Smith 1971).

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) requires employers to provide reasonable accommodation, including making existing facilities used by employees
readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities, restructuring jobs, modifying work schedules, acquiring or modifying equipment or devices, modifying examinations, training materials, or policies, and providing qualified readers or interpreters. Nonetheless, any faculty or staff members qualified as legally disabled under federal or state law also need to be qualified to perform the essential aspects of the job in spite of the disability (Rothstein 1991).

The USF Campus Climate Survey contained a number of questions designed to evaluate the climate at USF with respect to people with disabilities. Not only were respondents with disabilities asked a series of questions about their experiences at USF concerning accommodations, harassment, exclusivity or discrimination due to the disability, but both disabled and non-disabled employees were asked about their frequency in observing the mistreatment of people with disabilities.

In the climate survey, the respondent’s disability status was determined based on self-identification; respondents were asked “Do you currently have a disability/impairment that substantially limits a major life activity (such as seeing, hearing, learning, walking, etc.)?” A total of 66 (or 3.6%) of the 1,662 respondents who responded to this question answered in the affirmative.

Those who indicated that they have some form of disability or impairment were then asked to report the frequency with which they’ve experienced the following situations within the last year. The question asked: “How often during the past year at USF have you:

- experienced a lack of accommodations for your disability
- been put down intellectually because of your disability
- had someone challenge or attempt to embarrass you because of your disability
- avoided disclosing your disability due to fear of negative consequences
- felt isolated or left out when work was required in groups because of your disability
- felt left out of a social event or activity because of your disability
- experienced some other form of discrimination because of your disability

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they experienced each situation never (N), rarely (R), sometimes (S), or often (O). In order to analyze the results, the response categories themselves (i.e., never, rarely, etc.) were converted to numeric values in which 0=never, 1=rarely, 2=sometimes, and 3=often. Means were then calculated for each question item, and because the scale is a 4-point scale of 0-3, the values closest to 0 indicate low frequency and the values closest to 3 indicate high frequency.

Table 26 reports the results for each question item presented in descending order from the situation most often experienced by people with disabilities to the situation least often experienced. As Table 26 reports, people with disabilities, on average, report rarely, if ever, experiencing over mistreatment due to their disability status. Of the various situations people with disabilities were asked about, the most frequently encountered
situation – though still quite infrequent -- was lack of accommodations (mean=.85). In fact, numerous respondents, when asked to comment on their answers to these questions, stated that the university could do a better job of meeting ADA regulations for building accessibility. Some of the buildings identified as being particularly inaccessible are Cooper Hall (CPR), the Engineering Teaching Auditorium (ENA), the Chemistry Building (CHE), sections of the Library (LIB), and portions of the Recreation Center (REC). Some respondents specified the ways in which these buildings were inaccessible. The Library, for instance, is reported to be an unfriendly environment for deaf people and for people with motorized chairs. The Engineering Teaching Auditorium is reported to have inaccessible bathrooms, and the shower room in the Recreation Center is reported to be inaccessible to people in wheelchairs.

The second most frequently mentioned experience among people with disabilities is the decision to not disclose their disability due to a fear of negative consequences (mean=.82). This was followed by feeling left out when work was required in groups (mean=.69), feeling left out of a social event (mean=.67), experiencing some other form of discrimination (mean=.66), and having someone challenge or attempt to embarrass them (mean=.57). The situation least frequently encountered by people with disabilities was being put down intellectually (mean=.50).

These results indicate that although some people with disabilities experience various unpleasant situations or lack of accommodations, the frequency with which these occur is relatively low, as indicated by each of the mean values falling below 1. In other words, on average, people with disabilities at USF rarely, if ever, experience mistreatment due to their disability while on campus, but when they do, it is usually in the form of lack of accommodations or fear in disclosing their disability status.

**Suggestions for Improving the Climate for People with Disabilities**

All respondents to the survey were provided the opportunity to offer recommendations for improving the campus climate for people with disabilities. The exact question on the survey read: “Do you have any specific suggestions for how USF could improve the campus climate for people with disabilities?” Among the most common recommendations made by those who answered the question were: (1) improve access by regularly inspecting doors, sidewalks, and parking lots; (2) increase the number and visibility of signs and markers on campus; (3) work to ensure all buildings meet ADA requirements; (4) increase educational efforts among supervisors, faculty, staff, and students about disabilities and mental illness; and (5) offer events that foster dialogue and raise awareness.
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A&P staff typically have positions in administration and management and are appointed for contract periods. USPS staff typically have positions involving professional, paraprofessional, administrative, clerical, secretarial, technical, service, or maintenance duties. USPS employees, in contrast to A&P, gain permanent job status after completion of a probationary period.

Differences in scores between groups (e.g., between men and women) may be determined through simple observation, by using tests of statistical significance, and/or by employing Cohen’s (1977) concept of “importance.” Although tests of significance are reported in this document, we realize that such tests must be used with caution, especially because the survey is based on a non-random, non-probability sample. Some researchers may prefer using Cohen’s (1977) concept of “importance,” in which differences between groups are assigned various levels of importance based on the “effect size.” Using Cohen’s approach, a difference in mean scores between groups (e.g., between men and women) of approximately .35 (or .35 of a standard deviation) is minimally important; a difference of approximately .50 (or .50 of a standard deviation) is moderately important; and a difference of .67 or greater is very important. We believe that a combination of approaches is probably the best way to gauge the importance of differences in mean scores between groups.

The INFOMART data does not present the percentages of “Arab American/Middle Eastern,” Multi-racial,” or “Other” faculty and staff. Therefore, these groups were omitted from the comparison, even though the Campus Climate survey was able to capture respondents that belong to these groups.

Faculty’s dissatisfaction with salaries is understandable given USF’s ranking in this area among Research I schools within the Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB). SREB reported in July, 2002, that when the 29 Research I SREB schools are compared on weighted 9-month faculty salaries, USF ranks 27th with an average faculty salary of $52,819 compared with the SREB average of $65,287. UF ranked 9th ($63,508) and FSU 14th ($62,290) (Marks 2002).